

COHORT DIFFERENCES IN PERCEPTIONS OF  
HELPFUL COUNSELOR CHARACTERISTICS

Tamisha L. Utermark, B.S., M.S.

Dissertation Prepared for the Degree of  
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH TEXAS

August 2002

APPROVED:

Bert Hayslip, Jr., Major Professor and Chair  
Judy McConnell, Committee Member  
Becky Glover, Committee Member  
Lawrence Schneider, Committee Member and  
Program Coordinator for Counseling Psychology  
Ernest Harrell, Chair of the Department of Psychology  
C. Neal Tate, Dean of the Robert B. Toulouse School of  
Graduate Studies

Utermark, Tamisha L. Cohort differences in perceptions of helpful counselor characteristics. Doctor of Philosophy (Counseling Psychology), August, 2002, 112 pp., 16 tables, references, 34 titles.

The present study examined age cohort differences in older and younger adults as they relate to perceptions of helpful counselor characteristics. The present study also assessed whether previous help-seeking behavior influences perceptions of what counselor characteristics would be helpful. The social influence model is used as basis for predictions. The first research hypothesis for the present study was that there would be an age by cohort interaction in perceptions of helpful counselor characteristics at both Time 1 (1991) and Time 2 (2001). The second research hypothesis was that there would be a main effect for cohort, with more recently born cohorts preferring more interpersonal counselor characteristics. The third research hypothesis was that there would be a main effect for age in endorsement of the social influence model. The fourth research hypothesis was that there would be a significant difference between the perceptions of those individuals who had previously sought help from a mental health professional and those individuals who had not sought help, regardless of age and cohort. A revised Adjective Check List (Gough, 1965; Gough & Heilbrum, 1983) was used to assess perceptions of helpful counselor characteristics. Chi-square analyses, MANOVA/supplementary ANOVAs, and exploratory factor analyses were used to test the research hypotheses. The first and second research hypotheses were supported. The third research hypothesis was not supported. The fourth research hypothesis was supported for Time 1, but not for Time 2. Limitations of the present study and implications of this research are discussed.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES .....	iii
DISSERTATION BODY .....	1
APPENDIX.....	85
REFERENCES .....	106

## LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 1	Descriptive Statistics for Age Groups at Time 1 (1991) .....15
Table 2	Descriptive Statistics for Age Groups at Time 2 (2001) .....21
Table 3	Characteristics by Age Level for Time 2 Sample (2001) .....27
Table 4	Descriptive Statistics for Time 1 (1991) and Time 2 (2002) Groups .....35
Table 5	Characteristics Rated as Contributing to Expertness, Attractiveness, and Trustworthiness .....41
Table 6	Descriptive Statistics for Whether Sought Help Previously for Time 1 (1991) ..55
Table 7	Time 2 (2001) Descriptive Statistics for Whether Sought Help Previously .....61
Table 8	Characteristics by Sought Help for Time 2 (2001) Sample .....67
Table A1	Principal Components for the Time 1 (1991) Younger Group .....86
Table A2	Rotated Factor Matrix from Principal Components Analysis for Time 1 (1991) Younger Group .....87
Table A3	Principal Components for the Time 1 (1991) Older Group .....91
Table A4	Rotated Factor Matrix from Principal Components Analysis for Time 1 (1991) Older Group .....91
Table A5	Principal Components for the Time 2 (2001) Younger Group .....96
Table A6	Rotated Factor Matrix from Principal Components Analysis for Time 2 (2001) Younger Group .....96
Table A7	Principal Components for the Time 2 (2001) Older Group .....101
Table A8	Rotated Factor Matrix from Principal Components Analysis for Time 2 (2001) Older Group .....101

## COHORT DIFFERENCES IN PERCEPTIONS OF HELPFUL COUNSELOR CHARACTERISTICS

The population of older persons has grown rapidly during the past two decades (U. S. Bureau of the Census, 1998) and will continue to experience dramatic growth in the near future as the “baby boom” generation ages. The growing population of elderly will begin to place greater demands on the resources provided to them, including mental health resources (Koenig, George, & Schneider, 1994). The examination of older adults’ attitudes and utilization of mental health resources can help the mental health industry learn how to better serve the needs of the elderly. Currently, there seems to be a difference between older and younger cohorts’ attitudes towards mental health and their utilization of mental health services. Younger generations have more positive attitudes about mental health care than do older adults (Currin, Hayslip, Schneider, & Kooken, 1998; Lundervold & Young, 1992). In addition, younger cohorts are more receptive to utilizing mental health services (Lasoski, 1986) and are more likely to engage in self-referral to a mental health professional (Veroff, Kulka, & Douvan, 1981) than are older cohorts. Older generations are more likely to seek treatment from general physicians than from mental health professionals (Waxman, Carner, & Klein, 1984).

### Factors in Cohort Differences

A variety of factors have been suggested to help explain cohort differences in mental health attitudes and utilization of mental health services. Lasoski (1986) suggests there are professional barriers, such as societal and professional biases against active treatment for the elderly, that hinder the availability of mental health treatment for older adults. Practical barriers, such as cost of care, transportation problems, and lack of referral by primary care physicians, can also hinder older adults from receiving mental health treatment. In addition to professional

barriers and practical barriers, older adults may seem reluctant to seek mental health treatment because of their lack of knowledge about current mental health services, such as the present focus on outpatient care and prevention of institutionalization (Lasoski & Thelen, 1987), the effectiveness of psychotherapy (Waxman et al., 1984; Yang & Jackson, 1998), and knowledge of aging and mental health (Lundervold & Young, 1992). Personal factors such as religiosity can also affect older adults' attitudes about mental health (Lundervold & Young, 1992), as can the belief that mental health care is stigmatized (Lazarus, Sadavoy & Langsley, 1991; Lundervold & Young, 1992).

Waxman et al. (1984) conducted a study with older adults and found they perceived a low likelihood they would use mental health services in the future even if they were experiencing serious psychiatric symptoms. Instead, over 88% of the older adults reported that if they were going to seek help for psychiatric symptoms, they would do so from a general physician. The adults with more negative attitudes regarding mental health care, however, were less likely to perceive themselves as seeking any kind of professional help for psychiatric symptoms, whether from a general physician or a mental health professional. According to Waxman et al., the older adults' negative attitudes about mental health services seem to be due primarily to their lack of knowledge about mental health care and their lack of confidence in mental health professionals to help them.

When compared with individuals who have not experienced prior professional assistance for psychological problems, those individuals who have received mental health services report having more positive attitudes about mental health care. Those with previous experience with mental health care often attribute less stigma to mental health care, demonstrate interpersonal

openness, are better able to recognize their psychological needs, and have more confidence in mental health practitioners (Cash, Kehr, & Salzbach, 1978).

Yang and Jackson (1998) suggest another reason why older adults may be reluctant to seek counseling services is because they place a great deal of importance on independence and on being able to care for themselves. Because older adults are less apt to have knowledge about the current focus on outpatient treatment and prevention of institutionalization, older adults may expect to be placed in an institution if they seek psychological help and will view their independence as being threatened (Lasoski, 1986). The ability to care for oneself is associated with stronger feelings of control over one's own health. When compared to younger adults, older adults desire to be more self-sufficient in solving their health problems (Spitzer, Bar-Tal, & Liv, 1996).

Even among elderly persons, there are differences in mental health attitudes. Zank (1998) compared the mental health attitudes of older elderly persons ( $\geq 74$ ) and younger elderly persons ( $< 74$ ) and found younger elderly have less prejudice and fears about psychotherapy than do older elderly, indicating a positive cohort shift in attitude toward mental health. In addition, Waxman et al. (1984) found younger elderly persons ( $< 75$ ) are more likely than older elderly persons ( $\geq 75$ ) to seek professional help for symptoms that are more "mental" and less "physical." Similarly, future cohorts of older persons will probably have more positive attitudes towards mental health care and be more receptive to participating in available mental health services (Currin et al., 1998).

### Decision to Seek Therapy

Gurin, Veroff, and Feld (1960) describe a three-stage decision-making process that individuals move through when deciding whether to seek therapy. The first stage involves the

individual recognizing the problem as psychological, rather than physical or moral. Research indicates older adults' low utilization rates of mental health services may be strongly related to them being less likely than younger adults to identify problems as psychological (Lasoski & Thelen, 1987; Waxman et al., 1984), and this finding may be more of a cohort effect than an age effect. Koenig et al. (1994) suggest the "baby boom" cohort is much more likely than older adults to recognize psychological problems and to seek mental health services for these problems. Thus, it is likely that as this "baby boom" cohort ages, there will be incredible strain placed on the mental health system because of the larger number of future older adults who will be seeking services. In general, there seems to be a cohort shift towards seeing emotional problems as psychological and towards seeking psychological help for these problems.

The second stage involves the decision of whether to seek help for the psychological problem, rather than trying to work it out themselves or waiting for the problem to disappear. A historical shift toward more professional help-seeking has occurred (Veroff, Douvan, & Kulka, 1981). When help-seeking behavior in 1976 was compared with help-seeking behavior in 1957, people in 1976 were more prone to seek expert help than people in 1957, and, thus, less likely to deny their psychological problems. Over and above age, sex, education, or income level differences, those in 1976 were more likely than those in 1957 to see talking with others as sources of help when worried. Furthermore, there was more of a focus on intimate means of solving personally distressing problems and less emphasis on institutional means (e.g., memberships in groups such as churches) of solving these problems. This implies older (versus younger) cohorts will be less likely to deal with their problems by seeking out a mental health professional. On the other hand, what are considered personal or family matters by older persons are dealt with in a more outside help-seeking manner by younger persons. These 20-year



differences suggest future cohorts of older persons will be more likely to turn to others in times of trouble in the future, in that a cohort shift seems to have occurred in help-seeking behavior (Veroff et al., 1981).

After deciding to seek help, the third stage involves the decision of whether to seek professional psychological help. As Waxman et. al.'s study (1984) demonstrated, most older adults would choose to seek psychological help from their general physician than from professional mental health providers. Veroff, Douvan and Kulka (1981) found those who are younger are more likely to evidence more positive attitudes toward receiving professional help. Thus, younger (versus middle-aged and elderly) persons tend to be more psychological in their orientation toward asking for assistance from some professionally trained person. However, they also found a cohort shift in that those individuals who sought help in 1976 versus 1957 were more likely to select a specialized mental health-professional over a general help source (e.g., doctor, lawyer). In general, Veroff, Douvan, and Kulka suggest age effects on well-being or attitudes toward seeking mental health care are better explained by cohort/historical effects.

The current elderly population's moderately negative attitudes about mental health care can help explain their decision not to seek help from a mental health professional. To better understand their attitudes about mental health care, it would be helpful to examine the aspects of mental health service they would find helpful. Therefore, it is important to assess older adults' preferences regarding mental health services. By accommodating elders' preferences, mental health practitioners may be able to help decrease older individuals' general reluctance to receive mental health services, thereby increasing elder utilization of those services. Thompson and Scott (1991) examined older adults' preferences regarding potential features of counseling services, such as format, site, counselor age, and counselor expertise. The older adults'

responses indicated they preferred older aged, volunteer counselors and they did not have a specific preference for format or site of counseling. The respondents also expressed a greater future likelihood of using counseling services if the services contained features they preferred.

Other research has also looked at elder adults' preferences regarding aspects of mental health services. Hayslip, Schneider, and Bryant (1989) examined preferences of older women and found an interaction between the clients' preference for counselor age and the intimacy of the clients' problems. The older women reported they preferred older counselors when less intimate concerns were discussed and younger counselors when more intimate problems were discussed.

Research has also examined the issue of self-disclosure among younger adults. Schneider and Lankford (1978) examined preferences of younger college females and found that regardless of their disclosure histories, the students thought clients should disclose more intimate information with more highly trained helpers. This finding suggests there is an interaction between the clients' preference for counselor expertise and intimacy of the clients' concerns.

A pilot study (Utermark & Hayslip, 2000) found older adults and younger adults were significantly different in their perceptions of which counselor characteristics would be helpful. The younger adults endorsed significantly more characteristics as being helpful than did the older adults, suggesting the younger adults were less discriminating in their endorsements. It is likely the difference in discrimination is due to previous experience with mental health care professionals. Both younger and older adults considered a general trustworthiness factor to be the most important characteristic of mental health professionals. However, the two groups differed on what they considered to be the second most important factor. The older group considered credibility to be the second most important factor, while the younger group

considered counselor supportiveness and counselor empathy to be important. In general, it seems younger adults are more interested in the interpersonal characteristics of the counselor, which could be considered an aspect of the social attractiveness component of the social influence model. On the other hand, the older adults remain primarily interested in the counselor's trustworthiness and expertness, or general credibility.

### Social Influence Theory

A model that has examined client preferences and counselor characteristics is the social influence model (Strong, 1968). This model proposes that clients experience cognitive dissonance (Festinger, 1957) when the clients' cognitive constructs differ with the content of the counselor communications. According to the model, the client will be more likely to change his/her opinion to more closely match the counselor's ideas if the client perceives the counselor is credible and attractive. The counselor's credibility has two components: expertness and trustworthiness. Strong suggested a two-stage model of counseling. In the first stage, counselors strive to enhance their perceived expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness and the clients' involvement in counseling. In the second stage, counselors use their influence to help clients change their attitudes and/or behaviors.

Perceived counselor expertise involves the client's perception that the counselor has the knowledge and ability to effectively help the client with his/her problems. Counselor expertness can be perceived by objective evidence of the counselor's training, the counselor's reputation as expert, and the ability of the counselor to make rational and knowledgeable arguments and to present the arguments in a confident manner (Strong & Dixon, 1971).

Clients' perceptions of counselor trustworthiness can be assessed by the counselor's reputation, social role, sincerity and openness, lack of motivation for personal gain, and

confidentiality agreement. According to Strong (1968), perceived trustworthiness may be more important than perceived expertness, in that perceived untrustworthiness can reduce the impact of perceived expertness. Likewise, perceived trustworthiness can help increase the impact of an ambiguous level of expertness.

The social attractiveness of the counselor is another variable that can help reduce a client's cognitive dissonance and increase the counselor's level of influence in the therapeutic relationship. The counselor's social attractiveness is based on the client's liking of the counselor and the client's perceived compatibility and similarity with the counselor. The counselor's communication of empathy and understanding helps to increase the client's perception of similarity and compatibility with the therapist. In addition, the counselor's conveyance of unconditional positive regard, or acceptance and liking of the client without attached conditions, aids in the development of the client's reciprocal liking of the counselor. The counselor's social attractiveness gives the counselor power in the relationship in that the client likes the counselor and desires to be more similar to him/her (Schmidt & Strong, 1971).

Barak and Dell (1977) examined the relationship between undergraduate students' perceptions of a counselor on the dimensions of expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness, and the students' willingness to refer themselves to the counselor for help with a variety of hypothetical problems. The research findings demonstrate the higher the level of perceived expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness, the greater the likelihood the students would be willing to consult the counselor for each of the problems. Research indicates individuals can use these three dimensions of counselor characteristics to report their differential impressions of observed counselor performances (Barak & Dell, 1977; Barak & LaCrosse, 1975; LaCrosse & Barak, 1976).

The second stage of Strong's counseling model consists of the counselors using their influence to precipitate attitude and/or behavior change in their clients. Overall, the evidence is unclear as to whether perceived counselor expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness affects counselor influence, at least in the initial phase of counseling. Regardless of whether these characteristics exist, research demonstrates counselors typically influence some change in their clients (Corrigan, Dell, Lewis, & Schmidt, 1980). It is possible the role of the counselor in and of itself signals a certain amount of expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness to the client. Therefore, additional information supporting these counselor characteristics may not continue to increase the counselor's influence. However, if the counselor engages in behaviors that signal inexpertness, unattractiveness, or untrustworthiness, then the counselor's influence will likely be diminished and the legitimacy of the counselor role will be undermined.

The effects of perceived counselor attractiveness on the counselor's influence appears to be somewhat masked by perceived counselor expertness. However, when attractiveness is examined in combination with perceived expertness, attractive, inexpert counselors are more influential than unattractive, inexpert counselors. Therefore, perceived attractiveness is important, but likely accounts for only a small percentage of the variance when examining factors that increase counselor influence (Corrigan et al., 1980).

According to Corrigan et al. (1980), it is likely the legitimate power associated with the counselor role masks the effects of both counselor expertness and attractiveness in the initial phase of counseling. There has been little research on the relationship between perceived counselor trustworthiness and counselor influence. Trustworthiness may be one component of the counselor's legitimate power. Corrigan (1978) found that regardless of whether an individual was seeking help from a professional or a friend, the helper's trustworthiness was necessary in

establishing the helper's credibility. The helper's expertness was then considered to be important if seeking help from a professional, while the helper's attractiveness was of additional salience if seeking help from a friend.

### Rationale for Present Study

Little is known about the role of age or cohort effects as they relate to clients' perceptions of counselors. In addition, there has been little work on age cohort differences in clients' perceptions of helpful counselor characteristics and little work on examining older adults' preferences in general. Because older adults are not currently frequenting a mental health professional's office, it seems important to assess older adults' perceptions of what characteristics would be helpful if they were to go see a counselor for help with a problem.

Looking at potential clients' perspectives of what is helpful about counseling offers promising possibilities for understanding the counseling process. As social influence theory proposes, a counselor's characteristics, or the way a counselor interacts with a client, is an important aspect of the counseling process and can affect the degree of counselor influence. According to actual therapy clients and pseudo-clients, the role of the counselor's interpersonal style is a helpful element in the counseling process (Elliott, 1985; Elliott & James, 1989; Paulson, Truscott, & Stuart, 1999). As the results of the pilot study suggest, different cohorts of clients may prefer different counselor interpersonal styles (Hayslip & Utermark, 2001; Utermark & Hayslip, 2000). As the counselor's interpersonal style is considered to be important by clients, it is necessary to examine whether different cohorts of clients would prefer different counselor characteristics.

Therefore, the present study will examine age cohort differences in perceptions of helpful counselor characteristics and assess whether the social influence model is viable with older

adults. Based on the results of the pilot study (Hayslip & Utermark, 2001; Utermark & Hayslip, 2000), the first research hypothesis for the present study is that while there will be a significant difference between younger adults' and older adults' perceptions of helpful counselor characteristics at both Time 1 (1991) and Time 2 (2001), the difference will be less in 2001 than in 1991.

The second research hypothesis is that there will be a cohort effect, with more recently born cohorts (Time 2) preferring more interpersonal (attractiveness) counselor characteristics.

The third research hypothesis is that younger persons and older persons in both 1991 and 2001 will significantly differ in their endorsement of the social influence model, with older persons placing more emphasis on expertness and younger persons placing more emphasis on social attractiveness.

The fourth research hypothesis is that there will be a significant difference between the perceptions of those individuals who have previously sought help from a mental health professional and those individuals who have not sought help, regardless of age.

## Method

### Participants

All of the participants at both Time 1 and Time 2 were community-residing adults who were recruited from the University of North Texas and the metropollex. The participants used in the pilot study were assessed in 1991 and are considered to be the participants for Time 1. These participants consisted of 326 adults (35% males). Of the Time 1 sample, 139 of the participants were younger adults (45% males) and 181 of the participants were older adults (27% males). The younger adults ranged in age from 18 to 31, with a mean age of 20 and a mode of 19. The older adults ranged in age from 60 to 90, with a mean age of 70 and a mode of 65. Six older

adults did not indicate their gender. Eighteen percent of the Time 1 participants had previously sought help from a mental health professional. When previous help-seeking behavior is examined by age, 6% of older adults and 71% of younger adults reported having previously sought help from a mental health professional.

The participants at Time 2 were assessed in 2001 and consisted of 387 adults (33% males). Of the Time 2 sample, 197 of the participants were younger adults (37% male) and 181 of the participants were older adults (30% male). The younger adults ranged in age from 18 to 35, with a mean age of 23 and a mode of 22. The older adults ranged in age from 60 to 93, with a mean age of 74 and a mode of 75. Nine older adults did not indicate their gender. Thirty percent of the Time 2 participants had previously sought help from a mental health professional. When previous help-seeking behavior is examined by age, 22% of older adults and 36% of younger adults reported having previously sought help from a mental health professional. Two of the younger participants and 23 of the older participants did not report whether they had previously sought help.

### Measures

The Adjective Checklist (Gough, 1965; Gough & Heilbrun, 1983) used here was revised and shortened from 300 adjectives to 74 adjectives by eliminating redundant items (Utermark & Hayslip, 2000; Hayslip & Utermark, 2001). The reduced adjective list was given to the participant, who was then asked to “Check the adjectives that would be characteristic of a counselor who can help you.” This adjective list was one part of a larger survey administered to the participants at Time 1; however, only the results from the adjective list and basic demographic questions, such as age and gender, were used for the present study. The participants at Time 2 were also given the Adjective Checklist and asked basic demographic



questions about their age, gender, and educational level. The results from the question about highest educational level were invalid, as 94% of the younger participants and 83% of the older participants either did not answer the question or answered it incorrectly; some participants only reported the number of years of college education, whereas others counted all years of education. Therefore, educational level was not used as a variable in the present study. The participants were also asked whether they had ever sought help from a mental health professional. In addition to checking characteristics from the Adjective Checklist that would be helpful, the participants at Time 2 were asked to use a Likert-type scale to rate the characteristics according to the degree they would be helpful.

To provide an independent basis for the categorization of characteristics as defining expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness, a separate questionnaire was administered to a separate sample of 20 younger adults for the pilot study. These younger adults consisted primarily of psychology graduate students. Demographic questions of age and gender were not gathered on the pilot study sample. Rather than being asked to rate how helpful each characteristic was, these 20 adults were asked to rate each of the 74 characteristics from the Revised Adjective Checklist on a Likert-type scale regarding the degree to which each characteristic contributed positively to one of the three social influence model domains: counselor's attractiveness, expertness, and trustworthiness. For comparison purposes, 20 younger adults and 15 older adults at Time 2 were also asked to rate each characteristic according to the degree to which each characteristic contributed positively to each of the three domains. The 20 younger adults at Time 2 consisted primarily of undergraduate psychology students; their mean age was 22, and 15% of the sample was male. The 15 older adults were

recruited from senior centers. Their mean age was 76, and 14% of the sample was male. The older adults' educational level was not obtained.

### Research Design

The structure of perceptions of helpful counselors were derived from exploratory factor analyses of the covariance matrix derived from relationships between perceptions of characteristics of helpful counselors in each age group and at both Time 1 and Time 2, supplemented by the results of the above questionnaire data gathered from the 20 younger adults at Time 1. For the 2001 data, a one-way (by age) MANOVA/supplementary ANOVAs were used with the Likert-type scale data to determine the degree to which participants varying in age found certain counselor characteristics (those most centrally defining each factor derived from the exploratory analyses) helpful. Chi-square analyses explored whether previous help-seeking behavior influences perceived helpfulness of counselor characteristics as it covaries with age and cohort. For the 2001 data, a one-way (by help-seeking) MANOVA/supplementary ANOVAs were used with the Likert-type scale data to determine the degree to which participants varying in previous help-seeking behavior found certain counselor characteristics helpful. Supplemental exploratory 2 x 2 chi-square analyses were carried out to examine differences across age and across cohort in specific counselor characteristics.

### Results

Chi-square analyses were performed to determine whether there were significant gender differences between the Time 1 and Time 2 groups and between the older and younger samples. The results indicated there was a significant difference between gender and age group at Time 1 ( $\chi^2 = 11.399$ ,  $p < .01$ ), but not at Time 2 ( $\chi^2 = 1.873$ ,  $p > .05$ ).

## Hypothesis One

The first research hypothesis for the present study was that there would be a significant difference between younger adults' and older adults' perceptions of helpful counselor characteristics at both Time 1 (1991) and Time 2 (2001), and that the difference would be less at Time 2 than at Time 1. Chi-square analyses were performed to determine whether older and younger adults significantly differed at Time 1 in their perceptions of what characteristics would be helpful for a counselor to possess. Table 1 presents the descriptive statistics regarding the frequency of characteristic endorsement across the two age groups at Time 1.

Table 1

### Descriptive Statistics for Age Groups at Time 1 (1991)

Characteristic	Frequency Endorsed				
	Older Group <sup>a</sup>		Younger Group <sup>b</sup>		$\chi^2 (1)^c$
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	
Apathetic	10	6.6	51	36.7	68.492 **
Appreciative	66	42.9	89	64.0	13.143 **
Argumentative	3	2.0	30	21.6	27.974 **
Capable	117	76.5	118	84.9	3.288
Careless	4	2.6	1	0.7	1.536
Cautious	54	35.3	65	46.8	3.967 *
Clear-thinking	113	73.9	127	91.4	15.257 **
Cold	6	3.9	1	0.7	3.192

(table continues)

Table 1 Continued

Descriptive Statistics for Age Groups at Time 1 (1991)

Characteristic	Frequency Endorsed				$\chi^2 (1)^c$
	Older Group <sup>a</sup>		Younger Group <sup>b</sup>		
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	
Confident	67	43.8	123	88.5	64.020 **
Considerate	101	66.0	123	88.5	20.596 **
Conventional	14	9.2	31	22.3	9.664 **
Cooperative	77	50.3	104	74.8	18.543 **
Defensive	4	2.6	3	2.2	0.065
Dependable	101	66.0	118	84.9	13.845 **
Dignified	62	40.5	93	66.9	20.357 **
Dominant	2	1.3	17	12.2	14.397 **
Egotistical	1	0.7	3	2.2	1.221
Good looking	11	7.2	15	10.8	1.165
Hard-hearted	4	2.6	6	4.3	0.638
Helpful	111	72.5	125	89.9	14.192 **
Honest	124	81.0	126	90.6	5.453 *
Humorous	73	47.7	99	71.2	16.631 **
Indifferent	5	3.3	13	9.4	4.662 *
Individualistic	5	3.3	41	29.5	37.752 **

(table continues)

Table 1 Continued

Descriptive Statistics for Age Groups at Time 1 (1991)

Characteristic	Frequency Endorsed				$\chi^2 (1)^c$
	Older Group <sup>a</sup>		Younger Group <sup>b</sup>		
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	
Insightful	25	16.3	65	46.8	31.615 **
Intelligent	107	69.9	130	93.5	26.513 **
Logical	52	34.0	108	77.7	56.179 **
Mature	85	55.6	115	82.7	24.930 **
Methodical	19	12.4	32	23.0	5.681 *
Nervous	9	5.9	1	0.7	5.870 *
Opinionated	5	3.3	31	22.3	24.413 **
Patient	109	71.2	124	89.2	14.582 **
Persistent	16	10.5	84	60.4	80.775 **
Practical	72	47.1	96	69.1	14.436 **
Self-centered	3	2.0	1	0.7	0.831
Self-confident	42	27.5	72	51.8	18.142 **
Self-controlled	63	41.2	71	51.1	2.876
Sentimental	13	8.5	36	25.9	15.795 **
Serious	75	49.0	81	58.3	2.507
Sexy	5	3.3	11	7.9	3.035

(table continues)

Table 1 Continued

Descriptive Statistics for Age Groups at Time 1 (1991)

Characteristic	Frequency Endorsed				$\chi^2 (1)^c$
	Older Group <sup>a</sup>		Younger Group <sup>b</sup>		
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	
Sincere	99	64.7	110	79.1	7.455 **
Soft-hearted	50	32.7	36	25.9	1.612
Stable	89	58.6	116	83.5	21.623 **
Suggestible	35	23.0	79	56.8	34.827 **
Superstitious	2	1.1	1	0.7	0.253
Sympathetic	77	50.7	90	64.7	5.895 *
Thorough	74	48.7	86	61.9	5.100 *
Thoughtful	93	61.2	108	77.7	9.268 **
Trustworthy	114	75.0	124	89.2	9.840 **
Unconventional	2	1.3	11	7.9	7.406 **
Unemotional	33	21.7	8	5.8	15.270 **
Emotional	9	5.9	23	16.5	8.376 **
Enthusiastic	49	32.2	85	61.2	24.433 **
Evasive	0	0.0	4	2.9	4.435 *
Fault-finding	3	2.0	12	8.6	6.586 *
Forgiving	68	44.7	62	44.6	0.001

(table continues)

Table 1 Continued

Descriptive Statistics for Age Groups at Time 1 (1991)

Characteristic	Frequency Endorsed				$\chi^2 (1)^c$
	Older Group <sup>a</sup>		Younger Group <sup>b</sup>		
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	
Frank	87	57.2	73	52.5	0.653
Gentle	98	64.5	102	73.4	2.680
Praising	42	27.6	57	41.0	5.787 *
Prejudiced	0	0.0	0	0.0	N/A
Rational	37	24.3	100	71.9	66.028 **
Realistic	53	34.9	113	81.3	63.866 **
Relaxed	73	48.0	105	75.5	23.139 **
Resentful	3	2.0	1	0.7	0.843
Rigid	0	0.0	10	7.2	11.324 **
Old-fashioned	10	6.6	7	5.0	0.314
Unfriendly	2	1.1	0	0.0	1.842
Unselfish	47	30.9	70	50.4	11.412 **
Wholesome	59	38.8	56	40.3	0.066
Wise	94	61.8	111	79.9	11.317 **
Masculine	17	11.2	1	0.7	13.702 **
Feminine	20	13.2	7	5.0	5.690 *
Young	15	9.9	16	11.5	0.206
Old	25	16.4	2	1.4	19.429 **

<sup>a</sup>n ranged from 152 - 154. <sup>b</sup>n = 139. <sup>c</sup>N ranged from 291 - 293.

\*p < .05. \*\*p < .01

Older and younger adults at Time 1 differed significantly in their perceptions of what would constitute helpful counselor characteristics. Fifty-two of the above 74 chi-square tests performed were significant (p < .05). Multiplication of the total number of chi-square tests performed (N = 74) by the set alpha level (p = .05) resulted in a total of 4 chi-squares expected to be significant by chance alone.

Of the 74 characteristics, only the following seven characteristics were endorsed as being helpful by at least 70% of the younger Time 1 group and 70% of the older Time 1 group: capable, clear-thinking, helpful, honest, intelligent, patient, and trustworthy. In addition to these seven characteristics, at least 70% of the younger Time 1 group endorsed the following 14 characteristics as being helpful: confident, considerate, cooperative, dependable, humorous, logical, mature, sincere, stable, thoughtful, rational, realistic, relaxed, and wise.

Of the 52 characteristics that were endorsed significantly differently by the two groups, the younger Time 1 adults endorsed more characteristics (90%) as being helpful than did the older Time 1 adults (10%), even if the arbitrary 70% helpfulness percentage was not reached. The following 47 characteristics were significantly endorsed more by the younger adults than by the older adults: apathetic, appreciative, argumentative, cautious, clear-thinking, confident, considerate, conventional, cooperative, dependable, dignified, dominant, helpful, honest, humorous, indifferent, individualistic, insightful, intelligent, logical, mature, methodical, opinionated, patient, persistent, practical, self-confident, sentimental, sincere, stable, suggestible, sympathetic, thorough, thoughtful, trustworthy, unconventional, emotional, enthusiastic, evasive, fault-finding, praising, rational, realistic, relaxed, rigid, unselfish, and wise. Significantly more



older adults than younger adults endorsed the following five characteristics as being helpful: nervous, unemotional, masculine, feminine, and old. Hypothesis One was supported for Time 1.

Chi-square analyses were performed to determine whether older and younger adults significantly differed at Time 2 in their perceptions of what characteristics would be helpful for a counselor to possess. Table 2 presents the descriptive statistics regarding the frequency of characteristic endorsement across the two age groups at Time 2.

Table 2

Descriptive Statistics for Age Groups at Time 2 (2001)

Characteristic	Frequency Endorsed				$\chi^2 (1)^c$
	Older Group <sup>a</sup>		Younger Group <sup>b</sup>		
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	
Apathetic	31	16.3	79	40.1	26.896 **
Appreciative	126	66.3	123	62.4	0.634
Argumentative	12	6.3	28	14.2	6.509 *
Capable	159	83.7	163	82.7	0.062
Careless	3	1.6	5	2.5	0.440
Cautious	106	55.8	112	56.9	0.045
Clear-thinking	175	92.1	183	92.9	0.087
Cold	3	1.6	3	1.5	0.002
Confident	148	77.9	174	88.3	7.529 **
Considerate	172	90.5	173	87.8	0.734

(table continues)

Table 2 Continued

Descriptive Statistics for Age Groups at Time 2 (2001)

Characteristic	Frequency Endorsed				$\chi^2 (1)^c$
	Older Group <sup>a</sup>		Younger Group <sup>b</sup>		
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	
Conventional	39	20.5	42	21.3	0.037
Cooperative	146	76.8	158	80.2	0.649
Defensive	14	17.4	6	3.0	3.688
Dependable	164	86.3	178	90.4	1.536
Dignified	105	55.3	90	45.7	3.549
Dominant	10	5.3	14	7.1	0.565
Egotistical	6	3.2	2	1.0	2.193
Good looking	25	13.2	18	9.1	1.583
Hard-hearted	3	1.6	6	3.0	0.916
Helpful	174	91.6	182	92.4	0.086
Honest	182	95.8	186	94.4	0.391
Humorous	134	70.5	154	78.2	2.970
Indifferent	11	5.8	29	14.7	8.325 **
Individualistic	38	20.0	91	46.2	29.860 **
Insightful	94	49.5	167	84.8	54.880 **
Intelligent	165	86.8	188	95.4	8.904 **

(table continues)

Table 2 Continued

Descriptive Statistics for Age Groups at Time 2 (2001)

Characteristic	Frequency Endorsed				$\chi^2 (1)^c$
	Older Group <sup>a</sup>		Younger Group <sup>b</sup>		
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	
Logical	131	68.9	163	82.7	10.080 **
Mature	164	86.3	182	92.4	3.762
Methodical	59	31.1	76	38.6	2.412
Nervous	4	2.1	4	2.0	0.003
Opinionated	10	5.3	40	20.3	19.450 **
Patient	159	83.7	183	92.9	7.982 **
Persistent	50	26.3	109	55.3	33.637 **
Practical	138	72.6	149	75.6	0.455
Self-centered	7	3.7	5	2.5	0.423
Self-confident	131	68.9	156	79.2	5.293 *
Self-controlled	121	63.7	119	60.4	0.441
Sentimental	50	26.3	78	39.6	7.704 **
Serious	126	66.3	116	58.9	2.281
Sexy	12	6.3	12	6.1	0.008
Sincere	167	87.9	160	81.2	3.291
Soft-hearted	63	33.2	67	34.0	0.032

(table continues)

Table 2 Continued

Descriptive Statistics for Age Groups at Time 2 (2001)

Characteristic	Frequency Endorsed				$\chi^2 (1)^c$
	Older Group <sup>a</sup>		Younger Group <sup>b</sup>		
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	
Stable	140	73.7	157	79.7	1.958
Suggestible	64	33.7	91	46.2	6.303 *
Superstitious	3	1.6	4	2.0	0.111
Sympathetic	125	65.8	147	74.6	3.611
Thorough	136	71.6	154	78.2	2.239
Thoughtful	150	78.9	162	82.2	0.668
Trustworthy	169	88.9	186	94.4	3.814
Unconventional	20	10.5	24	12.2	0.263
Unemotional	34	17.9	21	10.7	4.152 *
Emotional	25	13.2	43	21.8	5.019 *
Enthusiastic	117	61.6	138	70.1	3.089
Evasive	3	1.6	10	5.1	3.644
Fault-finding	5	2.6	20	10.2	9.053 **
Forgiving	120	63.2	119	60.4	0.310
Frank	133	70.0	126	64.0	1.594
Gentle	147	77.4	139	70.6	2.326

(table continues)

Table 2 Continued

Descriptive Statistics for Age Groups at Time 2 (2001)

Characteristic	Frequency Endorsed				$\chi^2 (1)^c$
	Older Group <sup>a</sup>		Younger Group <sup>b</sup>		
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	
Praising	98	51.6	109	55.3	0.547
Prejudiced	2	1.1	3	1.5	0.168
Rational	109	57.4	140	71.1	7.909 **
Realistic	133	70.0	170	86.3	15.111 **
Relaxed	151	79.5	168	85.3	2.251
Resentful	3	1.6	4	2.0	0.111
Rigid	5	2.6	7	3.6	0.274
Old-fashioned	16	8.4	5	2.5	6.523 *
Unfriendly	1	0.5	2	1.0	0.301
Unselfish	90	47.4	114	57.9	4.278 *
Wholesome	105	55.3	89	45.2	3.935 *
Wise	138	72.6	153	77.7	1.314
Masculine	31	16.3	9	4.6	14.402 **
Feminine	41	21.6	24	12.2	6.110 *
Young	24	12.6	28	14.2	0.208
Old	30	15.8	20	10.2	2.732

<sup>a</sup>  $\underline{n} = 190$ . <sup>b</sup>  $\underline{n} = 197$ . <sup>c</sup>  $\underline{N} = 387$ .

\* $p < .05$ . \*\* $p < .01$

The older and younger adults at Time 2 differed significantly in their perceptions of what would constitute helpful counselor characteristics. Twenty-four of the above 74 chi-square tests were significant ( $p < .05$ ). Multiplication of the total number of chi-square tests performed ( $N = 74$ ) by the set alpha level ( $p = .05$ ) resulted in a total of 4 chi-squares expected to be significant by chance alone.

Of the 74 characteristics, only the following 22 characteristics were endorsed by at least 70% of the both the younger Time 2 group and the older Time 2 group: capable, clear-thinking, confident, considerate, cooperative, dependable, helpful, honest, humorous, intelligent, mature, patient, practical, sincere, stable, thorough, thoughtful, trustworthy, gentle, realistic, relaxed, and wise. In addition to these 22 characteristics, the only other characteristic that at least 70% of the older group indicated as being helpful was frank. In addition to these 22 characteristics, at least 70% of the younger group endorsed the following six characteristics as being helpful: insightful, logical, self-confident, sympathetic, enthusiastic, and rational.

Of the 24 characteristics that were endorsed significantly differently by the two groups, the younger Time 2 adults endorsed more characteristics (79%) as being helpful than did the older Time 2 adults (21%), even if the arbitrary 70% helpfulness percentage was not reached. Significantly more of the younger adults than the older adults endorsed the following 19 characteristics as being helpful: apathetic, argumentative, confident, indifferent, individualistic, insightful, intelligent, logical, opinionated, patient, persistent, self-confident, sentimental, suggestible, emotional, fault-finding, rational, realistic, and unselfish. Significantly more of the older adults than the younger adults endorsed the following five characteristics as being helpful: unemotional, old-fashioned, masculine, feminine, and wholesome.

A chi-square test was performed to determine whether there was a statistically significant difference between the number of significant chi-square tests at Time 1 and at Time 2. The results indicated there were significantly more differences between the older and younger adults' perceptions at Time 1 than there were at Time 2 [ $\chi^2(1) = 21.205$ ,  $p < .01$ ]. Thus, the first research hypothesis was supported.

As a further test of Hypothesis One, in addition to checking counselor characteristics as being helpful or not helpful, the younger Time 2 group and the older Time 2 group rated the counselor characteristics on a Likert-type scale from 1 to 5 according to their degree of helpfulness, with 1 being never helpful and 5 being always helpful. Table 3 presents the means and standard deviations of the endorsed characteristics by the younger group and the older group at Time 2.

Table 3

Characteristics by Age Level for Time 2 (2001) Sample

Characteristic	Extent of Endorsement			
	Young <sup>a</sup>		Old <sup>b</sup>	
	Mean	Stand Dev	Mean	Stand Dev
Apathetic	2.446	1.389	1.763	1.290
Appreciative	3.503	1.177	3.563	1.374
Argumentative	1.990	1.050	1.400	0.853
Capable	4.451	1.006	4.358	1.212
Careless	1.179	0.612	1.205	0.773

(table continues)

Table 3 Continued

Characteristics by Age Level for Time 2 (2001) Sample

Characteristic	Extent of Endorsement			
	Young <sup>a</sup>		Old <sup>b</sup>	
	Mean	Stand Dev	Mean	Stand Dev
Cautious	3.385	1.075	3.042	1.348
Clear-thinking	4.631	0.829	4.368	1.218
Cold	1.262	0.573	1.189	0.702
Confident	4.210	0.909	3.932	1.361
Considerate	4.390	0.948	4.153	1.244
Conventional	2.944	0.886	2.674	1.297
Cooperative	4.144	0.979	3.953	1.306
Defensive	1.518	0.795	1.537	1.027
Dependable	4.544	0.985	4.263	1.351
Dignified	3.379	1.184	3.300	1.391
Dominant	1.964	0.889	1.568	0.967
Egotistical	1.272	0.595	1.216	0.728
Good-looking	1.892	1.027	2.089	1.225
Hard-hearted	1.400	0.677	1.226	0.732
Helpful	4.610	0.768	4.142	1.254
Honest	4.605	0.857	4.353	1.271

(table continues)



Table 3 Continued

Characteristics by Age Level for Time 2 (2001) Sample

Characteristic	Extent of Endorsement			
	Young <sup>a</sup>		Old <sup>b</sup>	
	Mean	Stand Dev	Mean	Stand Dev
Humorous	3.805	0.981	3.500	1.255
Indifferent	2.215	1.128	1.384	0.845
Individualistic	2.974	1.164	2.105	1.127
Insightful	4.231	1.002	3.068	1.580
Intelligent	4.610	0.857	4.258	1.273
Logical	4.246	1.016	3.853	1.354
Mature	4.415	0.912	4.168	1.286
Methodical	3.241	1.148	2.958	1.325
Nervous	1.282	0.598	1.226	0.639
Opinionated	2.308	1.152	1.474	0.969
Patient	4.503	0.802	3.984	1.420
Persistent	3.544	1.113	2.663	1.354
Practical	3.897	1.070	3.595	1.364
Self-centered	1.236	0.588	1.332	0.873
Self-confident	3.826	1.206	3.679	1.428
Self-controlled	3.903	1.169	3.847	1.377

(table continues)

Table 3 Continued

Characteristics by Age Level for Time 2 (2001) Sample

Characteristic	Extent of Endorsement			
	Young <sup>a</sup>		Old <sup>b</sup>	
	Mean	Stand Dev	Mean	Stand Dev
Sentimental	2.933	1.075	2.653	1.307
Serious	3.513	1.076	3.605	1.316
Sexy	1.662	1.009	1.500	1.058
Sincere	4.251	0.976	4.242	1.278
Soft-hearted	3.108	1.159	2.979	1.325
Stable	4.354	0.943	4.142	1.324
Suggestible	3.118	1.385	2.853	1.357
Superstitious	1.426	0.680	1.232	0.650
Sympathetic	3.626	1.121	3.395	1.379
Thorough	4.349	0.975	4.032	1.395
Thoughtful	4.287	0.995	4.074	1.390
Trustworthy	4.692	0.817	4.384	1.283
Unconventional	2.492	1.022	1.889	1.081
Unemotional	2.005	1.008	2.074	1.249
Emotional	2.579	1.073	2.132	1.230
Enthusiastic	3.815	0.993	3.595	1.380

(table continues)

Table 3 Continued

Characteristics by Age Level for Time 2 (2001) Sample

Characteristic	Extent of Endorsement			
	Young <sup>a</sup>		Old <sup>b</sup>	
	Mean	Stand Dev	Mean	Stand Dev
Evasive	1.826	0.874	1.426	0.874
Fault-finding	1.836	1.017	1.442	0.905
Forgiving	3.610	1.127	3.500	1.375
Frank	3.569	1.205	3.711	1.347
Gentle	3.877	1.008	4.021	1.297
Praising	3.677	1.207	3.558	1.363
Prejudiced	1.179	0.550	1.253	0.755
Rational	3.897	1.149	3.405	1.515
Realistic	4.277	0.905	3.805	1.376
Relaxed	4.262	0.952	4.100	1.279
Resentful	1.297	0.612	1.247	0.808
Rigid	1.400	0.735	1.316	0.800
Old-fashioned	1.887	0.918	2.042	1.154
Unfriendly	1.205	0.582	1.242	0.819
Unselfish	3.913	1.116	3.458	1.471
Wholesome	3.451	1.154	3.742	1.404

(table continues)

Table 3 Continued

Characteristics by Age Level for Time 2 (2001) Sample

Characteristic	Extent of Endorsement			
	Young <sup>a</sup>		Old <sup>b</sup>	
	Mean	Stand Dev	Mean	Stand Dev
Wise	4.405	0.950	4.084	1.362
Masculine	2.159	1.108	2.442	1.416
Feminine	2.318	1.185	2.563	1.423
Young	2.338	1.161	2.342	1.295
Old	2.328	1.146	2.351	1.216

<sup>a</sup>  $\underline{n} = 195$  . <sup>b</sup>  $\underline{n} = 190$ .

Examining the means and standard deviations for the younger and older groups at Time 2, a MANOVA found a statistically significant between group difference, Wilks' Lambda (.370),  $F(74, 310) = 7.132$ ,  $p < .01$  for the linear combination of characteristics as a set. The univariate ANOVAs found that the younger Time 2 group and the older Time 2 group differed significantly in their endorsement on 37 of the 74 characteristics. The results from the analysis of the Likert-type scale ratings demonstrated more significant differences between the younger and the older Time 2 groups than did the dichotomous ratings of the Time 2 groups, which had resulted in 24 of the 74 characteristics being endorsed significantly differently. A chi-square test was performed to determine whether this difference between the 37 significant chi-squares on the Likert-type scale data and the 24 significant chi-squares on the dichotomous data was a statistically significant difference. The chi-square test indicated that significantly more differences were found between the younger and older groups when the Likert-scale ratings were

used, as compared to the dichotomous ratings [ $\chi^2(1) = 4.713, p < .05$ ]. This significant difference is an artifact of the greater potential range of Likert-type scale ratings versus dichotomous ratings.

The univariate ANOVAs found that the following characteristics yielded significant age differences: apathetic,  $F(1, 383) = 24.971, p < .01$ ; argumentative,  $F(1, 383) = 36.461, p < .01$ ; cautious,  $F(1, 383) = 7.615, p < .01$ ; clear-thinking,  $F(1, 383) = 6.133, p < .05$ ; confident,  $F(1, 383) = 5.607, p < .05$ ; considerate,  $F(1, 383) = 4.438, p < .05$ ; conventional,  $F(1, 383) = 5.711, p < .05$ ; dependable,  $F(1, 383) = 5.436, p < .05$ ; dominant,  $F(1, 383) = 17.310, p < .01$ ; helpful,  $F(1, 383) = 19.628, p < .01$ ; honest,  $F(1, 383) = 5.246, p < .05$ ; humorous,  $F(1, 383) = 7.089, p < .01$ ; indifferent,  $F(1, 383) = 66.674, p < .01$ ; individualistic,  $F(1, 383) = 51.292, p < .01$ ; insightful,  $F(1, 383) = 74.688, p < .01$ ; intelligent,  $F(1, 383) = 10.198, p < .01$ ; logical,  $F(1, 383) = 10.530, p < .01$ ; mature,  $F(1, 383) = 4.743, p < .05$ ; methodical,  $F(1, 383) = 5.031, p < .05$ ; opinionated,  $F(1, 383) = 58.948, p < .01$ ; patient,  $F(1, 383) = 19.583, p < .01$ ; persistent,  $F(1, 383) = 48.687, p < .01$ ; practical,  $F(1, 383) = 5.886, p < .05$ ; sentimental,  $F(1, 383) = 5.307, p < .05$ ; superstitious,  $F(1, 383) = 8.190, p < .01$ ; thorough,  $F(1, 383) = 6.714, p \leq .01$ ; trustworthy,  $F(1, 383) = 7.943, p < .01$ ; unconventional,  $F(1, 383) = 31.634, p < .01$ ; emotional,  $F(1, 383) = 14.521, p < .01$ ; evasive,  $F(1, 383) = 20.091, p < .01$ ; fault-finding,  $F(1, 383) = 16.073, p < .01$ ; rational,  $F(1, 383) = 12.944, p < .01$ ; realistic,  $F(1, 383) = 15.865, p < .01$ ; unselfish,  $F(1, 383) = 11.723, p < .01$ ; wholesome,  $F(1, 383) = 4.943, p < .05$ ; wise,  $F(1, 383) = 7.221, p < .01$ ; and masculine,  $F(1, 383) = 4.789, p < .05$ .

When compared to the older Time 2 adults, the younger Time 2 adults rated the following 35 characteristics as more helpful: apathetic, argumentative, cautious, clear-thinking, confident, considerate, conventional, dependable, dominant, helpful, honest, humorous, indifferent,

individualistic, insightful, intelligent, logical, mature, methodical, opinionated, patient, persistent, practical, sentimental, superstitious, thorough, trustworthy, unconventional, emotional, evasive, fault-finding, rational, realistic, unselfish, and wise. When compared to the younger Time 2 adults, the older Time 2 adults rated two characteristics, wholesome and masculine, as being more helpful.

When compared to the results from the dichotomous helpfulness ratings, the Likert-type scale results differ somewhat in that they suggest the two age groups are not significantly different in their endorsement of five characteristics: self-confident, suggestible, unemotional, old-fashioned, and feminine, whereas the dichotomous data indicated there were significant differences between the two age groups regarding endorsement of these five characteristics. Furthermore, the Likert-type scale results also differ from the dichotomous results in that the Likert-type scale results suggest the two age groups are significantly different in their endorsement of the following 17 characteristics that the dichotomous data did not indicate were endorsed significantly differently: clear-thinking, considerate, conventional, dependable, dominant, helpful, honest, humorous, mature, methodical, practical, superstitious, thorough, trustworthy, unconventional, evasive, and wise.

These results from the Likert-type scale data from Time 2 cannot really speak to the first hypothesis in that parallel Likert-type scale data does not exist for Time 1. However, the results do further support the finding that there are significant differences between the two Time 2 age groups in their perceptions of helpful counselor characteristics. In addition, the participants' pattern of responding to the Likert-type scale is similar to the findings from the dichotomous data in that the younger adults endorsed a significantly larger number of characteristics as being helpful than did the older adults.

## Hypothesis Two

The second research hypothesis was that there would be a cohort effect, with more recently born cohorts preferring more interpersonal counselor characteristics. Chi-square analyses were performed to determine whether the Time 1 group and the Time 2 group significantly differed, regardless of age differences. Table 4 presents these results.

Table 4

### Descriptive Statistics for Time 1 (1991) and Time 2 (2001) Groups

Characteristic	Frequency Endorsed				
	Time 1 (1991) Group <sup>a</sup>		Time 2 (2001) Group <sup>b</sup>		$\chi^2 (1)^c$
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	
Apathetic	67	19.9	115	28.3	45.227 **
Appreciative	160	52.8	261	64.1	9.226 **
Argumentative	41	13.6	40	9.8	2.407
Capable	239	79.1	341	83.8	2.513
Careless	12	4.0	8	2.0	2.525
Cautious	127	42.1	227	55.8	13.055 **
Clear-thinking	244	80.8	377	92.6	22.334 **
Cold	14	4.6	6	1.5	6.321 *
Confident	196	64.9	339	83.3	31.666 **
Considerate	229	75.8	363	89.2	22.462 **
Conventional	53	17.6	86	21.1	1.410

(table continues)

Table 4 Continued

Descriptive Statistics for Time 1 (1991) and Time 2 (2001) Groups

Characteristic	Frequency Endorsed				$\chi^2 (1)^c$
	Time 1 (1991) Group <sup>a</sup>		Time 2 (2001) Group <sup>b</sup>		
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	
Cooperative	185	61.3	317	77.9	23.189 **
Defensive	14	4.6	21	5.2	0.101
Dependable	222	73.5	361	88.7	27.365 **
Dignified	163	54.0	208	51.1	0.572
Dominant	26	8.6	26	6.4	1.230
Egotistical	11	3.6	8	2.0	1.869
Good looking	32	10.6	44	10.8	0.008
Hard-hearted	17	5.6	9	2.2	5.733 *
Helpful	239	79.1	375	92.1	25.243 **
Honest	253	83.8	388	95.3	26.703 **
Humorous	177	58.6	302	74.2	19.231 **
Indifferent	24	8.0	40	9.8	0.747
Individualistic	54	17.9	135	33.2	20.727 **
Insightful	96	31.8	274	67.3	87.726 **
Intelligent	240	79.5	370	90.9	18.882 **
Logical	164	54.3	312	76.7	39.264 **

(table continues)



Table 4 Continued

Descriptive Statistics for Time 1 (1991) and Time 2 (2001) Groups

Characteristic	Frequency Endorsed				$\chi^2 (1)^c$
	Time 1 (1991) Group <sup>a</sup>		Time 2 (2001) Group <sup>b</sup>		
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	
Mature	205	67.9	362	88.9	48.018 **
Methodical	60	19.9	143	35.1	19.776 **
Nervous	17	5.6	8	2.0	6.840 **
Opinionated	43	14.2	51	12.5	0.440
Patient	236	78.1	361	88.7	14.512 **
Persistent	110	36.4	168	41.3	1.714
Practical	174	57.6	304	74.7	23.016 **
Self-centered	11	3.6	12	3.0	0.266
Self-confident	119	39.4	302	74.2	87.030 **
Self-controlled	138	45.7	252	61.9	18.431 **
Sentimental	57	18.9	133	32.7	16.840 **
Serious	161	53.3	252	61.9	5.279 *
Sexy	23	7.6	24	5.9	0.828
Sincere	212	70.2	345	84.8	21.845 **
Soft-hearted	94	31.1	133	32.7	0.192
Stable	208	69.1	312	76.7	5.065 *

(table continues)

Table 4 Continued

Descriptive Statistics for Time 1 (1991) and Time 2 (2001) Groups

Characteristic	Frequency Endorsed				$\chi^2 (1)^c$
	Time 1 (1991) Group <sup>a</sup>		Time 2 (2001) Group <sup>b</sup>		
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	
Suggestible	119	39.5	158	38.8	0.037
Superstitious	10	3.3	8	2.0	1.285
Sympathetic	169	56.2	286	70.3	15.031 **
Thorough	164	54.5	306	75.2	33.222 **
Thoughtful	204	67.8	329	80.8	15.864 **
Trustworthy	242	80.4	374	91.9	20.217 **
Unconventional	20	6.7	45	11.1	4.040 *
Unemotional	46	15.3	56	13.8	0.326
Emotional	40	13.3	72	17.7	2.517
Enthusiastic	141	46.9	269	66.1	26.305 **
Evasive	11	3.7	13	3.2	0.112
Fault-finding	22	7.3	25	6.1	0.380
Forgiving	134	44.5	252	61.9	21.123 **
Frank	164	54.5	273	67.1	11.611 **
Gentle	203	67.4	303	74.4	4.164 *
Praising	105	34.9	220	54.1	25.608 **

(table continues)

Table 4 Continued

Descriptive Statistics for Time 1 (1991) and Time 2 (2001) Groups

Characteristic	Frequency Endorsed				$\chi^2 (1)^c$
	Time 1 (1991) Group <sup>a</sup>		Time 2 (2001) Group <sup>b</sup>		
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	
Prejudiced	7	2.3	5	1.2	1.250
Rational	144	47.9	262	64.4	19.336 **
Realistic	171	56.9	322	79.1	40.711 **
Relaxed	182	60.5	335	82.3	41.913 **
Resentful	11	3.7	8	2.0	1.890
Rigid	18	6.0	13	3.2	3.208
Old-fashioned	24	8.0	25	6.1	0.900
Unfriendly	9	3.0	3	0.7	5.271 *
Unselfish	123	40.9	212	52.1	8.746 **
Wholesome	119	39.5	204	50.1	7.819 **
Wise	211	70.1	306	75.2	2.271
Masculine	25	8.3	41	10.1	0.640
Feminine	34	11.3	66	16.2	3.454
Young	38	12.6	54	13.3	0.633
Old	34	11.3	53	13.0	0.479

<sup>a</sup> $\underline{n}$  = 301-302. <sup>b</sup> $\underline{n}$  = 407. <sup>c</sup> $\underline{N}$  = 708-709.

\* $p < .05$ . \*\* $p < .01$

The participants at Time 1 and Time 2 differed significantly in their perceptions of what would constitute helpful counselor characteristics. Forty-four of the above 74 chi-square tests were significant ( $p < .05$ ). Multiplication of the total number of chi-square tests performed ( $N = 74$ ) by the set alpha level ( $p = .05$ ) resulted in a total of 4 chi-square tests that would be significant by chance alone.

Of the 74 characteristics, only the following 11 characteristics were endorsed at least 70% of the time by both Time 1 and Time 2 participants: capable, clear-thinking, considerate, dependable, helpful, honest, intelligent, patient, sincere, trustworthy, and wise. In addition to the endorsement of these 11 characteristics, at least 70% of the Time 2 participants endorsed 14 other characteristics as being helpful as well: confident, cooperative, humorous, logical, mature, practical, self-confident, stable, sympathetic, thorough, thoughtful, gentle, realistic, and relaxed.

Of the 44 characteristics that were endorsed significantly differently by the Time 1 and Time 2 groups, the adults at Time 2 endorsed more characteristics (91%) as being helpful than did the adults at Time 1 (9%), even if the arbitrary 70% helpfulness percentage was not reached. Significantly more Time 2 adults than Time 1 adults endorsed the following 40 characteristics: apathetic, appreciative, cautious, clear-thinking, confident, considerate, cooperative, dependable, helpful, honest, humorous, individualistic, insightful, intelligent, logical, mature, methodical, patient, practical, self-confident, self-controlled, sentimental, serious, sincere, stable, sympathetic, thorough, thoughtful, trustworthy, unconventional, enthusiastic, forgiving, frank, gentle, praising, rational, realistic, relaxed, unselfish, and wholesome. Significantly more Time 1 adults than Time 2 adults endorsed the following four characteristics as being helpful: cold, hard-hearted, nervous, and unfriendly.

In order to determine which characteristics most uniquely define each of the three social influence model domains (expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness), each characteristic was rated on a Likert-type scale by a separate sample of 20 younger adults in the pilot study sample (Utermark & Hayslip, 2000) according to the degree that each characteristic positively contributed to each domain. Table 5 presents the characteristics rated as either a 4 (contributes more often than not) or a 5 (contributes a great deal) by at least 70% of the raters as contributing to at least one of the three domains (expertness, attractiveness, or trustworthiness).

Table 5

Characteristics Rated as Contributing to Expertness, Attractiveness, and Trustworthiness

<u>Expertness</u>	<u>Attractiveness</u>	<u>Trustworthiness</u>
Capable	Capable	Capable
Clear-thinking	-----	Clear-thinking
Confident	Confident	-----
-----	Considerate	Considerate
-----	Cooperative	-----
Dependable	Dependable	Dependable
-----	-----	Dignified
-----	Enthusiastic	-----
-----	Forgiving	-----
-----	-----	Frank
-----	Gentle	Gentle

(table continues)

Table 5 Continued

Characteristics Rated as Contributing to Expertness, Attractiveness, and Trustworthiness

Expertness	Attractiveness	Trustworthiness
-----	Good-looking	-----
Helpful	Helpful	-----
Honest	Honest	Honest
-----	Humorous	-----
Insightful	-----	-----
Intelligent	Intelligent	Intelligent
Logical	-----	Logical
Mature	-----	Mature
Patient	Patient	Patient
-----	Praising	-----
Rational	-----	-----
Realistic	-----	-----
-----	Relaxed	-----
-----	Self-confident	-----
-----	Sincere	Sincere
Stable	-----	Stable
-----	Sympathetic	-----
Thorough	-----	Thorough

(table continues)

Table 5 Continued

Characteristics Rated as Contributing to Expertness, Attractiveness, and Trustworthiness

Expertness	Attractiveness	Trustworthiness
Thoughtful	Thoughtful	Thoughtful
Trustworthy	-----	Trustworthy
Wise	Wise	Wise

Using the results from Table 4, and the results from Table 5 regarding which characteristics uniquely define each social influence model domain, the findings indicate the Time 2 participants endorsed more characteristics that uniquely define social attractiveness as being helpful than did the Time 1 participants. The participants at Time 1 did not endorse any characteristics that uniquely define social attractiveness as being helpful, while the participants at Time 2 endorsed eight of the nine social attractiveness characteristics as being helpful. In addition, the Time 2 participants endorsed one of the three characteristics that uniquely define expertness as being helpful, but did not endorse either of the two characteristics that uniquely define trustworthiness. Time 1 participants did not endorse any characteristic that uniquely defined expertness or trustworthiness. Thus, the second research hypothesis was supported.

Although the ratings from the young adult pilot sample (N=20) are used for the present study, it is important to note some differences between these data and the data collected for comparison purposes from 20 younger adults and 15 older adults at Time 2. When the ratings from the young adult pilot sample are compared with the ratings performed by the 20 younger and 15 older adults at Time 2, the three groups differ somewhat in which characteristics they rate as contributing positively to the three social influence model domains. Of the 32 characteristics

endorsed by the young adult pilot sample, which are listed in Table 4, 21 of those characteristics (63%) were also endorsed by both the 20 younger adults and 15 older adults at Time 2.

Therefore, the 21 characteristics which were endorsed by all three samples (20 young adult pilot sample, 20 younger Time 2, and 15 older Time 2) as contributing to at least one of the three social influence model domains (expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness) are as follows: capable, clear-thinking, confident, considerate, cooperative, dependable, helpful, honest, insightful, intelligent, logical, mature, patient, sincere, stable, thorough, thoughtful, trustworthy, gentle, relaxed, and wise. The young adult pilot sample endorsed 12 characteristics as positively contributing to at least one of the three domains that were not endorsed by either the 20 younger Time 2 adults or the 15 older Time 2 adults: dignified, enthusiastic, forgiving, frank, gentle, good-looking, humorous, praising, rational, realistic, self-confident, and sympathetic. When compared to the ratings of the young adult pilot sample, both the 20 younger and 15 older Time 2 adults rated the characteristic self-controlled as contributing positively to all three domains, whereas the young adult pilot sample did not rate self-controlled as contributing to any of the domains.

When the 20 younger Time 2 adults are compared to the 15 older Time 2 adults, the younger group rated the variables self-confident and realistic as contributing to at least one of the three domains, whereas the older group did not rate either of these two characteristics as positively contributing to any one of the three domains. When the 15 older Time 2 adults are compared to the young adult pilot sample and 20 younger Time 2 adults, the older sample endorsed the following five more characteristics as contributing positively to at least one of the three domains than did the younger adults: appreciative, methodical, practical, serious, and wholesome.



Of the 32 characteristics endorsed by the young adult pilot sample as positively contributing to at least one of the three social influence model domains, nine characteristics uniquely define social attractiveness: cooperative, enthusiastic, forgiving, good-looking, humorous, praising, relaxed, self-confident, and sympathetic. Three characteristics uniquely define expertness: insightful, rational, and realistic; and two characteristics uniquely define trustworthiness: dignified and frank.

Of the 24 characteristics endorsed by the 20 younger Time 2 adults as positively contributing to at least one of the three social influence model domains, four characteristics uniquely define social attractiveness: self-confident, thoughtful, gentle, and relaxed. Five characteristics uniquely define expertness: clear-thinking, insightful, logical, thorough, and realistic; and one characteristic, cooperative, uniquely defines trustworthiness.

Of the 33 characteristics endorsed by the 15 older Time 2 adults as contributing positively to at least one of the three social influence model domains, only one characteristic, praising, uniquely defines social attractiveness; and only one characteristic, persistent, uniquely defines expertness. No characteristics were rated as uniquely contributing to trustworthiness by the 15 older Time 2 adults.

Although there are some differences between the young adult pilot sample, the 20 younger Time 2 adults, and the 15 older Time 2 adults in their endorsement of which characteristics contribute to the three social influence model domains, the results from the young adult pilot sample were used in the present study to determine which characteristics uniquely define each of the three domains.

### Hypothesis Three

The third research hypothesis was that younger and older persons would significantly differ in their endorsement of the social influence model, with older persons placing more emphasis on expertness and younger persons placing more emphasis on social attractiveness. Exploratory factor analyses were performed to test this hypothesis. In order to further establish which characteristics defined the components of the social influence model, the following 32 characteristics rated by the 20 younger adults at Time 1 as contributing positively to at least one of the three social influence model domains were included in the exploratory factor analyses: capable, clear-thinking, confident, considerate, cooperative, dependable, dignified, good-looking, helpful, honest, humorous, insightful, intelligent, logical, mature, patient, self-confident, sincere, stable, sympathetic, thorough, thoughtful, trustworthy, enthusiastic, forgiving, frank, gentle, praising, rational, realistic, relaxed, and wise. These characteristics are also listed in Table 5.

As mentioned previously, of these 32 characteristics, nine characteristics uniquely define social attractiveness, three characteristics uniquely define expertness, and two characteristics uniquely define trustworthiness. According to the young adult pilot sample raters (N=20), the remaining characteristics contribute to more than one domain. Tables A1 – A8 present the results from the exploratory factor analyses, which are based on the 32 characteristics rated as contributing positively to the social influence model domains. The interpretation of these factors is subjective and exploratory. The first five factors for each sample are discussed.

Time 1 Younger Group. For the Time 1 younger adult group (N = 139), ten principal components were extracted that accounted for 63.3% of the common variance among the correlation between the characteristic ratings. Twenty-three percent of this variance was accounted for by Factor 1. Table A1 presents the eigenvalues and percentage of common

variance associated with each principal component for the younger Time 1 sample. Table A2 presents the rotated factor matrix for the ten factors resulting from the principal components analysis for the Time 1 younger group.

The first factor resulting from the principal components analysis for the Time 1 younger group seems to reflect counselor sensitivity, in that it is most strongly defined by the characteristics cooperative and sympathetic; this factor is moderately defined by the characteristics forgiving, gentle, trustworthy, and confident. The second factor seems to reflect counselor supportiveness, in that it is mostly defined by the characteristics thoughtful, relaxed, self-confident, enthusiastic, and praising. The third factor seems to reflect counselor credibility, in that it is defined by characteristics that contribute to both expertness and trustworthiness; this factor is most strongly defined by the characteristics logical and realistic and is moderately defined by the characteristics clear-thinking, dependable, trustworthy, and frank. The fourth factor is defined by characteristics that seem to contribute evenly to expertness, trustworthiness, and attractiveness; it is most strongly defined by the characteristics capable, patient, confident, considerate, insightful, and intelligent. The fifth factor seems to reflect counselor encouragement; the characteristics that most strongly define this factor are humorous and praising, both characteristics that contribute uniquely to counselor attractiveness. Other characteristics that moderately define this fifth factor are enthusiastic, forgiving, stable, and thorough. Results from the oblique rotation for the Time 1 younger group indicated that the average correlation between the ten factors was .258, ranging from a low of .002 to a high of .898. In sum, using the 1991 young data, the younger group appears to place more emphasis on counselor social attractiveness initially and then on counselor credibility.

Time 1 Older Group. For the Time 1 older adult group (N = 187), eight principal components were extracted that accounted for 62.4% of the common variance among the correlation between the characteristic ratings. One-third of this variance (33%) was accounted for by Factor 1. Table A3 presents the eigenvalues and percentage of common variance associated with each principal component for the older Time 1 sample. Table A4 presents the rotated factor matrix for the eight factors resulting from the principal components analysis for the Time 1 older group.

The first factor resulting from the principal components analysis for the Time 1 older group seems to reflect general trustworthiness and is defined most strongly by the following characteristics: trustworthy, stable, thoughtful, and gentle. In addition, the characteristics humorous, forgiving, and relaxed, all primarily social attractiveness characteristics, contribute moderately to this factor as well. The second, third, and fourth factors in the older sample seem to reflect general credibility, in that they combine both expertness and trustworthiness characteristics primarily. The second factor is most strongly defined by the characteristic dignified; in addition, other characteristics that contribute moderately to this factor are frank, clear-thinking, wise, confident, helpful, logical, enthusiastic, and relaxed. The third factor reflects counselor trustworthiness and is defined most strongly by the characteristics considerate, dependable, helpful, and intelligent and is defined moderately by two additional characteristics: capable and clear-thinking. The fourth factor also seems to reflect counselor trustworthiness; it is most strongly defined by the two characteristics honest and patient and is moderately defined by the characteristics intelligent, mature, and frank. The fifth factor reflects counselor sensitivity and is most strongly defined by the characteristics cooperative and sympathetic, which are primarily social attractiveness characteristics. Three other characteristics that moderately

contribute to this factor are praising, dependable, and thorough. Results from the oblique rotation for the Time 1 older group indicated that the average correlation between the ten factors was .295, ranging from a low of .004 to a high of .748. Using the older adult 1991 data, the older sample appears to initially place more emphasis on counselor trustworthiness and expertness and then may begin to find social attractiveness characteristics helpful.

Time 2 Younger Group. For the Time 2 younger adult group (N = 197), ten principal components were extracted that accounted for 60.5% of the common variance among the correlation between the characteristic ratings. Twenty-one percent of this variance was accounted for by Factor 1. Table A5 presents the eigenvalues and percentage of common variance associated with each principal component for the younger Time 2 sample. Table A6 presents the rotated factor matrix for the ten factors resulting from the principal components analysis for the Time 2 younger group.

The first factor resulting from the principal components analysis for the Time 2 younger group seems to reflect counselor expertness, in that it is most strongly defined by the characteristics rational, thorough, and capable and is moderately defined by the characteristics insightful, intelligent, and sincere. The second factor seems to reflect counselor sensitivity, in that it is most strongly defined by the characteristics cooperative and sympathetic and moderately defined by the characteristics considerate, thoughtful, forgiving, and gentle. The third factor reflects counselor trustworthiness; it is mostly defined by the characteristics trustworthy, mature, and dependable. The fourth factor reflects counselor confidence as it is most strongly defined by the characteristics self-confident and confident, which appear to be redundant variables. However, the characteristic self-confident contributes uniquely to attractiveness, while the characteristic confident contributes to both attractiveness and

expertness. The characteristic sincere also moderately defines the fourth factor. The fifth factor reflects counselor calmness, in that it is most strongly defined by the characteristic relaxed and is moderately defined by the characteristics gentle and wise. Results from the oblique rotation for the Time 2 younger group indicated that the average correlation between the ten factors was .256, ranging from a low of .017 to a high of .791. In sum, using the 2001 data for young adults, the younger sample initially places more emphasis on counselor expertness, then on counselor social attractiveness, and finally, on counselor trustworthiness.

Time 2 Older Group. For the Time 2 older adult group (N = 190), ten principal components were extracted that accounted for 63.8% of the common variance among the correlation between the characteristic ratings. Twenty-six percent of this variance was accounted for by Factor 1. Table A7 presents the eigenvalues and percentage of common variance associated with each principal component for the older Time 2 sample. Table A8 presents the rotated factor matrix for the ten factors resulting from the principal components analysis for the Time 2 older group.

The first factor resulting from the principal components analysis for the Time 2 older group seems to reflect counselor supportiveness, in that it is most strongly defined by the characteristics forgiving, gentle, and praising. The characteristics sympathetic and wise also contribute to this factor. The second factor is most strongly defined by expertness characteristics, specifically insightful and rational. Other characteristics moderately contribute to this second factor: dignified, logical, self-confident, thorough, enthusiastic, realistic, and relaxed. The third factor reflects counselor thoughtfulness and is most strongly defined by the characteristic considerate; it is moderately defined by the characteristics sincere, humorous, patient, and thoughtful. The fourth and fifth factors seem to reflect general counselor credibility.

The fourth factor is most strongly defined by the characteristic clear-thinking and is moderately defined by the characteristics capable and dependable. The fifth factor is most strongly defined by the characteristic trustworthy and is moderately defined by the characteristics logical, stable, thorough, and thoughtful. Results from the oblique rotation for the Time 2 older group indicated that the average correlation between the ten factors was .264, ranging from a low of .009 to a high of .809. In sum, using the 2001 data from the older sample, the older group seems to place more emphasis on social attractiveness characteristics, and then on counselor expertness and trustworthiness.

Tests of Hypothesis 3 for Time 1. When the results from the descriptive statistics for the younger Time 1 sample (Table 1) are examined, along with the results from the exploratory factor analysis (Tables A1 and A2), the findings suggest the characteristics endorsed by the younger Time 1 adults as being helpful parallel the characteristics that load strongly on the first five factors derived from the exploratory factor analysis. Of the 21 counselor characteristics endorsed as being helpful by at least 70% of the younger Time 1 group, 14 (67%) of those characteristics contribute to the first five factors of the exploratory factor analysis for the younger Time 1 sample: cooperative and confident (contribute to Factor 1), thoughtful and relaxed (contribute to Factor 2), logical, realistic, clear-thinking, dependable, and trustworthy (contribute to Factor 3), capable, patient, considerate, intelligent, and confident (contribute to Factor 4), and humorous (contributes to Factor 5).

When the results from the descriptive statistics for the older Time 1 sample (Table 1) are examined, along with the results from the exploratory factor analysis (Tables A3 and A4), the findings suggest the characteristics endorsed by the older Time 1 adults as being helpful parallel the characteristics that load strongly on the first four factors derived from the exploratory factor

analysis. All seven counselor characteristics endorsed as being helpful by at least 70% of the older Time 1 group strongly contribute to the first, third, and fourth factors of the exploratory factor analysis for the older Time 1 sample: trustworthy (contributes to Factor 1), helpful, intelligent, capable, clear-thinking (contribute to Factor 3), and honest and patient (contribute to Factor 4).

As mentioned previously, when examining differences in perceptions of helpful counselor characteristics, chi-square analyses resulted in 52 of the 74 counselor characteristics being endorsed differently by the younger and older Time 1 samples (Table 1). Of these 52 characteristics, a higher percentage of the younger sample endorsed 47 of the characteristics as being helpful than did the older sample. Even though 70% of the younger sample may not have endorsed the characteristic, a significantly higher number of the younger participants endorsed each of the 47 characteristics as being helpful than did the older participants. Of these 47 characteristics, 27 of them were characteristics identified as contributing positively to one of the three social influence model domains. Of those 27 characteristics, 11 of them uniquely define one of the domains. Four of the characteristics contributed uniquely to expertness: insightful, logical, rational, and realistic. Six of the characteristics contributed uniquely to attractiveness: cooperative, humorous, sympathetic, enthusiastic, praising, and relaxed; and one of the characteristics, dignified, contributed uniquely to trustworthiness. Of the 52 characteristics endorsed differently, a higher percentage of the older Time 1 sample endorsed five characteristics as being helpful than did the younger Time 1 sample; however, none of the five characteristics were rated as contributing positively to any one of the three social influence model domains.



Tests of Hypothesis 3 for Time 2. When the results from the descriptive statistics for the younger Time 2 sample (Table 2) are examined, along with the results from the exploratory factor analysis (Tables A5 and A6), the findings suggest that the characteristics endorsed by the younger Time 2 adults as being helpful parallel the characteristics that load strongly on the first five factors derived from the exploratory factor analysis. Of the 28 counselor characteristics endorsed as being helpful by at least 70% of the younger Time 2 group, 18 (75%) of the characteristics contribute to the first five factors of the exploratory factor analysis for the younger Time 2 sample: rational, thorough, capable, insightful, intelligent, and sincere (contribute to Factor 1), cooperative, sympathetic, considerate, thoughtful, and gentle (contribute to Factor 2), trustworthy, mature, and dependable (contribute to Factor 3), self-confident, confident, and sincere (contribute to Factor 4), and relaxed and wise (contribute to Factor 5).

When the results from the descriptive statistics for the older Time 2 sample (Table 2) are examined, along with the results from the exploratory factor analysis (Tables A7 and A8), the findings suggest that the characteristics endorsed by the older Time 2 adults as being helpful parallel the characteristics that load strongly on the first five factors derived from the exploratory factor analysis. Of the 23 counselor characteristics endorsed as being helpful by at least 70% of the older Time 2 group, 15 (65%) of those characteristics contribute to the first five factors of the exploratory factor analysis for the older Time 2 sample: gentle and wise (contribute to Factor 1), thorough, realistic, and relaxed (contribute to Factor 3), considerate, sincere, humorous, patient, and thoughtful (contribute to Factor 4), and trustworthy, stable, thorough, and thoughtful (contribute to Factor 5).

As mentioned previously, when examining differences in perceptions of helpful counselor characteristics, chi-square analyses resulted in 24 of the 74 counselor characteristics

being endorsed differently by the younger and older Time 2 samples (Table 2). Of these 24 characteristics, a significantly higher percentage of the younger sample endorsed 19 of the characteristics as being helpful than did the older sample. Even though 70% of the younger sample may not have endorsed each characteristic, a significantly higher number of younger participants endorsed the 19 characteristics as being helpful than did the older participants. Of these 19 characteristics, eight of them were characteristics identified as contributing positively to one of the three social influence model domains. Of those eight, four of the characteristics uniquely define one of the domains. Three of the characteristics contributed uniquely to expertness: insightful, rational, and realistic; and one of the characteristics contributed uniquely to attractiveness: self-confident. Of the 24 characteristics endorsed differently, a higher percentage of the older Time 2 sample endorsed five characteristics as being helpful than did the younger Time 2 sample; however, none of the five characteristics were rated as contributing positively to one of the three social influence model domains. In sum, Hypothesis 3 was not supported.

#### Hypothesis Four

The fourth research hypothesis was that there would be a significant difference between the perceptions of those individuals who had previously sought help from a mental health professional and those individuals who had not sought help, regardless of age. Chi-square analyses were performed to determine whether individuals who had previously sought help from a mental health professional significantly differed at Time 1 in their perceptions of what characteristics would be helpful for a counselor to possess. Table 6 presents the descriptive statistics regarding the frequency of characteristic choice across the two groups at Time 1 regarding whether they had sought help previously.

Table 6

Descriptive Statistics for Whether Sought Help Previously for Time 1 (1991)

Characteristic	Frequency Endorsed				$\chi^2 (1)^c$
	Sought Help <sup>a</sup>		Not Sought Help <sup>b</sup>		
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	
Apathetic	14	26.9	50	20.2	2.647
Appreciative	31	59.6	126	52.5	0.871
Argumentative	7	13.5	33	13.8	0.004
Capable	42	80.8	192	80.3	0.005
Careless	0	0.0	10	4.2	2.253
Cautious	24	46.2	99	41.4	0.392
Clear-thinking	45	86.5	193	80.8	0.960
Cold	0	0.0	13	5.4	2.961
Confident	40	76.9	151	63.2	3.577
Considerate	44	84.6	180	75.3	2.085
Conventional	10	19.2	42	17.6	0.080
Cooperative	31	59.6	150	62.8	0.180
Defensive	1	1.9	11	4.6	0.776
Dependable	44	84.6	172	72.0	3.572
Dignified	30	57.7	130	54.4	0.188
Dominant	7	13.5	17	7.1	2.275

(table continues)

Table 6 Continued

Descriptive Statistics for Whether Sought Help Previously for Time 1 (1991)

Characteristic	Frequency Endorsed				$\chi^2 (1)^c$
	Sought Help <sup>a</sup>		Not Sought Help <sup>b</sup>		
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	
Egotistical	1	1.9	9	3.8	0.437
Good looking	3	5.8	28	11.7	1.587
Hard-hearted	4	7.7	12	5.0	0.587
Helpful	43	82.7	188	78.7	0.424
Honest	48	92.3	197	82.4	3.133
Humorous	33	63.5	140	58.6	0.423
Indifferent	4	7.7	19	8.0	0.004
Individualistic	16	30.8	38	15.9	6.249 *
Insightful	24	46.2	71	29.7	5.254 *
Intelligent	47	90.4	188	78.7	3.778
Logical	36	69.2	126	52.7	4.718 *
Mature	40	76.9	161	67.4	1.827
Methodical	10	19.2	47	19.7	0.005
Nervous	0	0.0	15	6.3	3.441
Opinionated	8	15.4	34	14.2	0.046
Patient	45	86.5	185	77.4	2.150

(table continues)

Table 6 Continued

Descriptive Statistics for Whether Sought Help Previously for Time 1 (1991)

Characteristic	Frequency Endorsed				$\chi^2 (1)^c$
	Sought Help <sup>a</sup>		Not Sought Help <sup>b</sup>		
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	
Persistent	28	53.9	80	33.5	7.595 **
Practical	35	67.3	137	57.3	1.762
Self-centered	0	0.0	9	3.8	2.021
Self-confident	23	44.2	94	39.3	0.427
Self-controlled	25	48.1	110	46.0	0.072
Sentimental	9	17.3	46	19.3	0.105
Serious	32	61.5	127	53.1	1.216
Sexy	2	3.9	20	8.4	1.250
Sincere	43	82.7	163	68.2	4.337 *
Soft-hearted	17	32.7	73	30.5	0.092
Stable	45	86.5	159	66.8	7.965 **
Suggestible	28	53.9	90	37.8	4.545 *
Superstitious	0	0.0	8	3.4	1.798
Sympathetic	30	57.7	135	56.7	0.016
Thorough	33	63.5	126	52.9	1.907
Thoughtful	32	61.5	166	69.8	1.328

(table continues)

Table 6 Continued

Descriptive Statistics for Whether Sought Help Previously for Time 1 (1991)

Characteristic	Frequency Endorsed				$\chi^2 (1)^c$
	Sought Help <sup>a</sup>		Not Sought Help <sup>b</sup>		
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	
Trustworthy	48	92.3	188	79.0	4.994 *
Unconventional	7	13.5	12	5.0	4.941 *
Unemotional	2	3.9	44	18.5	6.855 **
Emotional	7	13.5	31	13.0	0.007
Enthusiastic	31	59.6	107	45.0	3.676
Evasive	2	3.9	8	3.4	0.030
Fault-finding	1	1.9	20	8.4	2.668
Forgiving	23	44.2	108	45.4	0.023
Frank	36	69.2	124	52.1	5.063 *
Gentle	40	76.9	158	66.4	2.187
Praising	20	38.5	83	34.9	0.240
Prejudiced	0	0.0	6	2.5	1.339
Rational	35	67.3	107	45.0	8.530 **
Realistic	40	76.9	128	53.8	9.378 **
Relaxed	41	78.9	136	57.1	8.452 **
Resentful	0	0.0	10	4.2	2.263

(table continues)

Table 6 Continued

Descriptive Statistics for Whether Sought Help Previously for Time 1 (1991)

Characteristic	Frequency Endorsed				$\chi^2 (1)^c$
	Sought Help <sup>a</sup>		Not Sought Help <sup>b</sup>		
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	
Rigid	1	1.9	16	6.7	1.782
Old-fashioned	2	3.9	20	8.4	1.264
Unfriendly	0	0.0	8	3.4	1.798
Unselfish	24	46.2	96	40.3	0.596
Wholesome	26	50.0	90	37.8	2.640
Wise	40	76.9	165	69.3	1.188
Masculine	1	1.9	22	9.2	3.132
Feminine	5	9.6	27	11.3	0.130
Young	9	17.3	27	11.3	1.396
Old	3	5.8	28	11.8	1.607

<sup>a</sup>  $n = 52$ . <sup>b</sup>  $n =$  ranged from 238 -240. <sup>c</sup>  $N =$  ranged from 290-292.

\* $p < .05$ . \*\* $p < .01$

Fourteen of the above 74 chi-square tests were significant ( $p < .05$ ). Multiplication of the total number of chi-square tests performed ( $N = 74$ ) by the set alpha level ( $p = .05$ ) resulted in a total of 4 chi-square tests expected to be significant by chance alone.

Of the above 74 characteristics, only the following nine characteristics were endorsed by at least 70% of the group who had previously sought help and 70% of the group who had not

previously sought help: capable, clear-thinking, considerate, dependable, helpful, honest, intelligent, patient, and trustworthy. These nine characteristics were the only characteristics endorsed as being helpful by the group who had not previously sought help. In contrast, 70% of the group who had previously sought help indicated that eight other characteristics were helpful as well, including confident, mature, sincere, stable, gentle, realistic, relaxed, and wise.

The group who had sought help and the group who had not sought help at Time 1 differed significantly ( $p < .05$ ) at Time 1 in their perceptions of what would constitute helpful counselor characteristics. Significantly more individuals who had sought help than those who had not sought help endorsed the following 12 characteristics as being helpful: individualistic, insightful, persistent, sincere, stable, suggestible, trustworthy, unconventional, frank, rational, realistic, and relaxed. Significantly more individuals who had not sought help than those who had sought help endorsed the characteristic “unemotional” as being helpful. Because of the significant differences between the Time 1 group who had previously sought help and the Time 1 group who had not previously sought help, Hypothesis Four was supported for Time 1.

A chi-square analysis was performed to determine whether individuals who had previously sought help from a mental health professional significantly differed at Time 2 in their perceptions of what characteristics would be helpful for a counselor to possess. Table 7 presents the descriptive statistics regarding the frequency of characteristic choice across the two groups at Time 2 regarding whether they have sought help previously.



Table 7

Time 2 Descriptive Statistics for Whether Sought Help Previously

Characteristic	Amount Endorsed				$\chi^2 (1)^c$
	<u>Sought Help Previously</u>		<u>Not Sought Help Previously</u>		
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	
Apathetic	38	32.2	74	26.7	1.227
Appreciative	69	37.9	182	65.7	1.867
Argumentative	9	7.6	29	10.5	0.769
Capable	98	83.1	233	84.1	0.069
Careless	0	0.0	8	2.9	3.478
Cautious	63	53.4	155	56.0	0.221
Clear-thinking	113	95.8	252	91.0	2.703
Cold	1	0.9	5	1.8	0.507
Confident	98	83.1	229	82.7	0.008
Considerate	108	91.5	244	88.1	1.009
Conventional	19	16.1	63	22.7	2.219
Cooperative	93	78.8	212	76.5	0.244
Defensive	6	5.1	13	4.7	0.028
Dependable	106	89.8	243	87.7	0.356
Dignified	61	51.7	139	49.5	0.076
Dominant	4	3.4	22	7.9	2.789

(table continues)

Table 7 Continued

Time 2 Descriptive Statistics for Whether Sought Help Previously

Characteristic	Amount Endorsed				$\chi^2 (1)^c$
	<u>Sought Help Previously</u>		<u>Not Sought Help Previously</u>		
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	
Egotistical	1	0.9	7	2.5	1.177
Good looking	8	6.8	34	12.3	2.629
Hard-hearted	3	2.5	6	2.2	0.053
Helpful	107	90.7	258	93.1	0.715
Honest	111	94.1	265	95.7	0.463
Humorous	88	74.6	204	73.7	0.037
Indifferent	11	9.3	28	10.1	0.058
Individualistic	46	39.0	82	29.6	3.324
Insightful	93	78.8	174	62.8	9.668 **
Intelligent	112	94.9	247	89.2	3.298
Logical	94	79.7	209	75.5	0.821
Mature	103	87.3	248	89.5	0.420
Methodical	47	39.8	93	33.6	1.416
Nervous	2	1.7	6	2.2	0.093
Opinionated	17	14.4	31	11.2	0.801
Patient	107	90.7	244	88.1	0.561

(table continues)

Table 7 Continued

Time 2 Descriptive Statistics for Whether Sought Help Previously

Characteristic	Amount Endorsed				$\chi^2 (1)^c$
	<u>Sought Help Previously</u>		<u>Not Sought Help Previously</u>		
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	
Persistent	59	50.0	106	38.3	4.683 *
Practical	89	75.4	206	74.4	0.049
Self-centered	1	0.9	9	3.3	1.934
Self-confident	90	76.3	204	73.7	0.300
Self-controlled	66	55.9	175	63.2	1.826
Sentimental	40	33.9	90	32.5	0.074
Serious	70	59.3	174	62.8	0.428
Sexy	6	5.1	16	5.8	0.075
Sincere	101	85.6	233	84.1	0.138
Soft-hearted	34	28.8	93	33.6	0.860
Stable	97	82.2	205	74.0	3.088
Suggestible	41	34.8	109	39.4	0.745
Superstitious	2	1.7	6	2.2	0.093
Sympathetic	88	74.6	189	68.2	1.590
Thorough	88	74.6	208	75.1	0.012
Thoughtful	95	80.5	222	80.1	0.007

(table continues)

Table 7 Continued

Time 2 Descriptive Statistics for Whether Sought Help Previously

Characteristic	Amount Endorsed				$\chi^2 (1)^c$
	<u>Sought Help Previously</u>		<u>Not Sought Help Previously</u>		
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	
Trustworthy	108	91.5	255	92.1	0.032
Unconventional	14	11.9	28	10.1	0.269
Unemotional	10	8.5	44	15.9	3.850 *
Emotional	22	18.6	46	16.6	0.241
Enthusiastic	83	70.3	178	64.3	1.364
Evasive	4	3.4	8	2.9	0.071
Fault-finding	4	3.4	19	6.9	1.816
Forgiving	72	61.0	170	61.4	0.004
Frank	80	67.8	185	66.8	0.038
Gentle	84	71.2	208	75.1	0.654
Praising	61	51.7	151	54.5	0.264
Prejudiced	0	0.0	3	1.1	1.288
Rational	83	70.3	170	61.4	2.890
Realistic	99	83.9	214	77.3	2.219
Relaxed	99	83.9	226	81.6	0.303
Resentful	1	0.9	5	1.8	0.507

(table continues)

Table 7 Continued

Time 2 Descriptive Statistics for Whether Sought Help Previously

Characteristic	Amount Endorsed				$\chi^2 (1)^c$
	<u>Sought Help Previously</u>		<u>Not Sought Help Previously</u>		
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	
Rigid	4	3.4	9	3.3	0.005
Old-fashioned	4	3.4	19	6.9	1.816
Unfriendly	1	0.9	2	0.7	0.017
Unselfish	64	54.2	141	50.9	0.369
Wholesome	54	45.8	140	50.5	0.756
Wise	85	72.0	211	76.2	0.755
Masculine	12	10.2	26	9.4	0.058
Feminine	23	19.5	39	14.1	1.832
Young	18	15.3	33	11.9	0.821
Old	13	11.0	39	14.1	0.679

<sup>a</sup> $\underline{n} = 118$  . <sup>b</sup> $\underline{n} = 277$ . <sup>c</sup> $\underline{N} = 395$  .

\* $p < .05$ . \*\* $p < .01$

Three of the 74 chi-square tests were significant ( $p < .05$ ). Multiplication of the total number of chi-square tests performed ( $N = 74$ ) by the set alpha level ( $p = .05$ ) resulted in a total of 4 chi-square tests expected to be significant by chance alone.

Of the 74 characteristics, the following 24 characteristics were endorsed by at least 70% of the group who had previously sought help and the group who had not previously sought help: capable, clear-thinking, confident, considerate, cooperative, dependable, helpful, honest,

humorous, intelligent, logical, mature, patient, practical, self-confident, sincere, stable, thorough, thoughtful, trustworthy, gentle, realistic, relaxed, and wise. In addition to these characteristics, 70% of the group who had sought help indicated that the following five characteristics were also helpful: insightful, sympathetic, enthusiastic, and rational. Except for the characteristics that both groups agreed were helpful, the group who had not sought help previously did not find any other characteristics helpful at least 70% of the time.

The group who had sought help and the group who had not sought help differed significantly ( $p < .05$ ) at Time 2 in their perceptions of whether three specific characteristics were helpful. These results should be interpreted cautiously as three significant chi-square tests would be expected based on chance. Significantly more individuals who had previously sought help than those who had not previously sought help endorsed the following two characteristics: insightful and persistent. Significantly more individuals who had not sought help than those who had sought help endorsed the characteristic unemotional as being helpful. Thus, although Hypothesis Four was supported for Time 1, it was not supported for Time 2.

As a further test of Hypothesis Four, in addition to checking characteristics as being helpful or not helpful, the participants at Time 2 rated the characteristics on a Likert-type scale from 1 to 5 according to their degree of helpfulness, with 1 being never helpful and 5 being always helpful. Table 8 presents the means and standard deviations of endorsed characteristics by Time 2 participants who had previously sought help from a mental health professional and Time 2 participants who had not previously sought help.

Table 8

Characteristics by Sought Help for Time 2 (2001) Sample

Characteristic	Extent of Endorsement			
	Sought Help <sup>a</sup>		Not Sought Help <sup>b</sup>	
	Mean	Stand Dev	Mean	Stand Dev
Apathetic	2.254	1.463	2.076	1.339
Appreciative	3.483	1.175	3.575	1.300
Argumentative	1.814	0.995	1.644	0.972
Capable	4.627	0.760	4.338	1.180
Careless	1.220	0.741	1.178	0.668
Cautious	3.254	1.192	3.225	1.214
Clear-thinking	4.653	0.831	4.447	1.084
Cold	1.246	0.640	1.229	0.647
Confident	4.127	1.000	4.102	1.176
Considerate	4.364	0.921	4.269	1.134
Conventional	2.831	0.972	2.847	1.146
Cooperative	4.008	1.008	4.069	1.177
Defensive	1.449	0.843	1.567	0.947
Dependable	4.525	0.967	4.367	1.238
Dignified	3.458	1.167	3.316	1.315
Dominant	1.822	0.883	1.745	0.956

(table continues)

Table 8 Continued

Characteristics by Sought Help for Time 2 (2001) Sample

Characteristic	Extent of Endorsement			
	Sought Help <sup>a</sup>		Not Sought Help <sup>b</sup>	
	Mean	Stand Dev	Mean	Stand Dev
Egotistical	1.271	0.649	1.233	0.659
Good-looking	1.890	1.068	2.033	1.125
Hard-hearted	1.339	0.719	1.313	0.707
Helpful	4.475	0.864	4.356	1.009
Honest	4.483	1.044	4.495	1.075
Humorous	3.737	1.025	3.622	1.154
Indifferent	1.966	1.154	1.738	1.013
Individualistic	2.754	1.205	2.487	1.265
Insightful	4.085	1.202	3.513	1.478
Intelligent	4.619	0.826	4.375	1.147
Logical	4.263	0.910	3.982	1.269
Mature	4.483	0.855	4.207	1.173
Methodical	3.127	1.173	3.135	1.238
Nervous	1.212	0.504	1.273	0.647
Opinionated	1.975	1.151	1.847	1.123
Patient	4.347	0.982	4.244	1.206

(table continues)



Table 8 Continued

Characteristics by Sought Help for Time 2 (2001) Sample

Characteristic	Extent of Endorsement			
	Sought Help <sup>a</sup>		Not Sought Help <sup>b</sup>	
	Mean	Stand Dev	Mean	Stand Dev
Persistent	3.390	1.177	3.055	1.318
Practical	3.924	1.022	3.713	1.273
Self-centered	1.280	0.703	1.284	0.730
Self-confident	3.814	1.198	3.753	1.333
Self-controlled	3.856	1.164	3.895	1.307
Sentimental	2.907	1.125	2.749	1.220
Serious	3.593	1.040	3.535	1.233
Sexy	1.525	0.985	1.582	1.020
Sincere	4.390	0.906	4.211	1.190
Soft-hearted	3.025	1.143	3.033	1.242
Stable	4.373	0.932	4.200	1.211
Suggestible	2.898	1.323	2.982	1.379
Superstitious	1.373	0.664	1.302	0.639
Sympathetic	3.602	1.118	3.465	1.276
Thorough	4.331	1.013	4.138	1.254
Thoughtful	4.322	0.995	4.131	1.258

(table continues)

Table 8 Continued

Characteristics by Sought Help for Time 2 (2001) Sample

Characteristic	Extent of Endorsement			
	Sought Help <sup>a</sup>		Not Sought Help <sup>b</sup>	
	Mean	Stand Dev	Mean	Stand Dev
Trustworthy	4.695	0.862	4.487	1.138
Unconventional	2.441	0.966	2.145	1.111
Unemotional	2.161	1.117	2.029	1.136
Emotional	2.593	1.156	2.280	1.139
Enthusiastic	3.864	0.942	3.669	1.257
Evasive	1.746	0.889	1.596	0.880
Fault-finding	1.678	0.995	1.629	0.963
Forgiving	3.576	1.135	3.578	1.263
Frank	3.814	1.086	3.600	1.315
Gentle	4.017	0.934	3.916	1.204
Praising	3.636	1.130	3.625	1.321
Prejudiced	1.203	0.516	1.215	0.690
Rational	4.042	1.057	3.520	1.433
Realistic	4.297	0.918	3.960	1.230
Relaxed	4.305	0.892	4.138	1.169
Resentful	1.246	0.640	1.273	0.716

(table continued)

Table 8 Continued

Characteristics by Sought Help for Time 2 (2001) Sample

Characteristic	Extent of Endorsement			
	Sought Help <sup>a</sup>		Not Sought Help <sup>b</sup>	
	Mean	Stand Dev	Mean	Stand Dev
Rigid	1.331	0.667	1.367	0.792
Old-fashioned	1.941	0.936	1.967	1.065
Unfriendly	1.203	0.607	1.215	0.705
Unselfish	3.839	1.117	3.665	1.355
Wholesome	3.585	1.120	3.611	1.325
Wise	4.373	0.950	4.204	1.239
Masculine	2.500	1.252	2.204	1.251
Feminine	2.636	1.238	2.342	1.310
Young	2.593	1.127	2.240	1.241
Old	2.559	1.114	2.284	1.229

<sup>a</sup> $\underline{n} = 118$ . <sup>b</sup> $\underline{n} = 275$ .

Examining the means and standard deviations for the Time 2 group who had previously sought help and the Time 2 group who had not previously sought help, a MANOVA did not find a statistically significant between group difference, Wilks' Lambda (.784),  $F(74, 318) = 1.187$ ,  $p > .05$ , for the linear combination of characteristics as a set. Because there was not a significant between-group difference, the supplementary ANOVAs are not reported. Thus, similar to the dichotomous data for Time 2, the Likert-type scale data for Time 2 also does not support Hypothesis Four.

## Discussion

The first research hypothesis was supported in that there was a significant difference between younger adults' and older adults' perceptions of helpful counselor characteristics at both Time 1 (1991) and Time 2 (2001); however, as hypothesized, the difference was significantly less in 2001 than in 1991. The younger adults endorsed a larger number of characteristics as being helpful at both Time 1 and Time 2 than did the older adults; however, this difference was less at Time 2. This finding may indicate older adults are more discriminating in who they would consider to be helpful, given they endorsed a smaller number of characteristics as being helpful. In contrast, the younger adults' perceptions seem to be relatively generic in that they are defined by a large array of qualities.

It is possible the older adults' consistent pattern across two times of measurement of endorsing a fewer number of characteristics as helpful derives from their minimal experience with mental health professionals. For example, at Time 1, 71% of the younger sample reported having previously sought help from a mental health professional, whereas only 6% of older adults reported previous use of mental health services. Furthermore, at Time 2, 36% of the younger sample and 22% of the older sample had previously sought help from a mental health professional. Although differences in help-seeking existed at both Time 1 and Time 2, the difference in percentage of participants who had previously sought help and those who had not sought help was smaller at Time 2 than at Time 1. It is interesting that the difference between the number of characteristics endorsed as being helpful was less at Time 2 than at Time 1 as well. It is likely there is a relationship between previous help-seeking behavior and one's discrimination when determining helpful counselor characteristics. The results suggest that previous experience with a mental health professional may be related to less discrimination, or a

more generic view of helpful counselors. The reason for the dramatic decrease in utilization rates between Time 1 and Time 2 by younger adults is unclear. It is possible the increase in utilization rates between Time 1 and Time 2 by older adults is a reflection of a gradual cohort shift in older adults' openness to seeking mental health care and the existence of fewer barriers to effective access of mental health care. According to the results related to Hypothesis Four, which are discussed in greater detail below, a difference in perceptions was found at Time 1, but not at Time 2, between those individuals who had and had not used mental health services. The lack of a significant difference between the two groups at Time 2 is somewhat expected if people's attitudes toward mental health care have shifted positively over time and if mental health services have generally become more available to people.

The second research hypothesis was that there would be a cohort effect, with more recently born cohorts (2001) preferring more interpersonal (attractiveness) counselor characteristics. The results indicated there was a significant difference in perceptions of helpful counselor characteristics between the participants at Time 1 and Time 2, regardless of age group. The characteristics endorsed by at least 70% of both Time 1 and Time 2 groups as being helpful seemed to contribute evenly to counselor expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness. At least 70% of the Time 2 participants endorsed an additional 14 characteristics as being helpful. The Time 2 participants endorsed more characteristics as being helpful overall; consequently, a higher number of attractiveness characteristics, as well as a higher number of characteristics defining trustworthiness and expertness, were endorsed by Time 2 participants. When these 14 characteristics endorsed by Time 2 are examined more closely, 36% of the characteristics contribute uniquely to attractiveness, and 7% contribute uniquely to expertness. The remaining characteristics contribute to more than one domain. Therefore, although Time 2 participants

endorsed a larger number of attractiveness characteristics, this finding should be interpreted cautiously since they endorsed a larger number of characteristics overall.

The third research hypothesis was that younger persons and older persons at both Time 1 and Time 2 would differ significantly in their endorsement of the social influence model, with older persons placing more emphasis on expertness and younger persons placing more emphasis on social attractiveness. The interpretation of these factors is subjective and exploratory. The first five factors in each sample are discussed.

The exploratory factor analysis resulted in ten factors for the younger Time 1 (1991) sample. In the younger sample, 23% of the common variance was accounted for by the first factor, which reflects counselor empathy. The second factor reflects counselor supportiveness. Both counselor empathy and counselor supportiveness are components of social attractiveness. The third factor reflects counselor credibility in that it is defined by variables that contribute to both expertness and trustworthiness. The fourth factor is defined by variables that seem to contribute evenly to expertness, trustworthiness, and attractiveness, and the fifth factor reflects counselor encouragement, which contributes to social attractiveness. In sum, using the 1991 young data, the younger group initially places more emphasis on counselor social attractiveness and then on counselor credibility, which includes both counselor expertness and trustworthiness.

The results indicating that the younger Time 1 adults placed primary importance on counselor attractiveness is different from the results obtained when the younger Time 1 data was analyzed previously (Utermark & Hayslip, 2000). Previous results indicated the younger Time 1 adults placed primary importance on counselor trustworthiness, and then on counselor attractiveness next. For the present study, the age groups were made more discrete, in that younger was defined as below age 35 and older was defined as above age 60; as a result, the

present analysis included three fewer young adult participants and eight fewer older adult participants than the previous analysis included. Although unlikely, it is possible this minor change in number of younger participants affected the outcome and accounts for the change in the younger Time 1 factor structure. However, the older Time 1 group lost more participants and their factor structure was not greatly affected. As a result, a reason for the change in the younger Time 1 factor structure from the previous analysis (Utermark & Hayslip, 2000) is unclear.

The exploratory factor analysis resulted in eight factors for the older Time 1 (1991) sample. In the older sample, one-third of the common variance was accounted for by the first factor. The first factor reflects general trustworthiness. The second factor reflects counselor credibility, which includes both counselor expertness and trustworthiness. The third and fourth factors reflect counselor trustworthiness. The fifth factor reflects counselor sensitivity, which is a component of social attractiveness. Using the older adult 1991 data, the older sample initially places more emphasis on counselor trustworthiness, then on general counselor credibility, which includes both trustworthiness and expertness, and finally on counselor social attractiveness. This factor structure is similar to the factor structure derived from the previous analysis of the Time 1 older adults data (Utermark & Hayslip, 2000).

The exploratory factor analysis resulted in ten factors for the younger Time 2 (2001) sample. In the younger sample, 21% of the common variance was accounted for by the first factor, which reflects counselor expertness. The second factor reflects counselor sensitivity, a social attractiveness component. The third factor reflects counselor trustworthiness, and the fourth factor reflects counselor confidence, which is a component of expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness. The fifth factor reflects counselor calmness, which is most strongly defined by a social attractiveness characteristic and moderately defined by trustworthiness and

expertness characteristics. In sum, using the 2001 data for young adults, the younger sample initially places more emphasis on counselor expertness, then on counselor social attractiveness, and finally, on counselor trustworthiness.

The exploratory factor analysis resulted in ten factors for the older Time 2 (2001) sample. In the older sample, 26% of the common variance was accounted for by the first factor, which reflects counselor supportiveness, a component of social attractiveness. The second factor reflects counselor discernment, a component of counselor expertness. The third factor reflects counselor thoughtfulness, which seems to be a component of both counselor social attractiveness and counselor trustworthiness. The fourth and fifth factors seem to reflect general counselor credibility, which includes both counselor expertness and trustworthiness. In sum, using the 2001 data from the older sample, the older group places more emphasis on social attractiveness characteristics, and then on counselor expertness and trustworthiness characteristics.

Overall, there does not seem to be a consistent picture regarding what the older and younger age groups value in a helpful counselor. The findings suggest the younger Time 1 participants and the older Time 2 participants place more emphasis on social attractiveness characteristics. In contrast, the older Time 1 participants place more emphasis on counselor trustworthiness, and the younger Time 2 participants place more emphasis on counselor expertness. Thus, an age by time of measurement framework explains these data.

For each one of the four samples, the results from the exploratory factor analyses indicated characteristics defining each domain of the social influence model were represented in the first five factors for each group, suggesting all three domains are important when looking at perceived counselor helpfulness. These exploratory results suggest each of the social influence model domains has relevance, and they support the existence of the three domains. The results



suggest the factor structure is more complex than the social influence theory proposes, in that more than three factors seem to contribute to perceptions of counselor helpfulness. Confirmatory factor analyses are recommended in future research to determine whether a specific three-factor model fits with the data.

When help-seeking behavior is examined, the data indicated a relationship exists between previous experience with a counselor and current perceptions of what would be helpful counselor characteristics. The extent of the group's experience seems to influence what attributes of the social influence model are emphasized as being most helpful. The groups who had more relative experiences with counselors (Time 1 younger group, Time 2 older group) preferred characteristics that defined social attractiveness, suggesting a counselor's social attractiveness is of primary importance. The groups who had less relative experiences with counselors (Time 1 older group, Time 2 younger group) preferred characteristics that defined counselor trustworthiness and expertness.

At Time 1, older adults may have lacked confidence in mental health professionals (Waxman et al., 1984) due to their relative inexperience with the mental health system; therefore, their interest in the counselor's credibility was likely based on their general lack of trust in mental health professionals' ability to help them. At Time 2, however, older adults reported having had more experience with mental health professionals than at Time 1. It is likely their emphasis on social interpersonal factors is related to their higher confidence in mental health professionals. For example, Cash et al. (1978) found those who had previous experience with mental health professionals were more likely to have higher confidence in them. Because of younger adults' experience with mental health professionals, they may have already had an adequate level of confidence in counselors' expertness. Therefore, at Time 1, they tended to

look at social factors and personal characteristics as a way to differentiate more helpful counselors from non-helpful counselors. At Time 2, however, the younger adults seemed to place more emphasis on counselor expertness, which is a puzzling finding.

One possible explanation is that fewer younger adults at Time 2 reported having had previously sought help from a mental health professional than the younger adults at Time 1. Therefore, more of the younger adults at Time 2 lacked experience with the mental health system and may not have had as much confidence in mental health professionals based on their inexperience with them. Another possible explanation is that younger adults may have become less satisfied with the mental health services they have received and, consequently, may have begun to lose confidence in mental health professionals to help them. As a result, they have begun to place more importance on counselor expertness. These explanations are tentative and should be interpreted cautiously due to the findings related to the fourth hypothesis. In sum, the third research hypothesis was not supported.

The fourth research hypothesis was that there would be a significant difference between the perceptions of those individuals who had previously sought help from a mental health professional and those individuals who had not sought help, regardless of age. The results indicated there was a significant difference between these two groups at Time 1, but not at Time 2. Therefore, the research hypothesis was only partially supported. At Time 1, 18% of the participants had previously used mental health services, compared to 30% of the participants at Time 2. This increase in utilization of mental health services over time is likely related to increased access to services and a positive shift in attitudes towards mental health care. Consequently, the lack of a difference at Time 2 between the participants who had sought help and those who had not sought help at Time 2 may be a reflection of an overall cohort shift in

attitudes about mental health care and greater overall access to help. It is possible the cohort changes over time in perceptions about mental health care in general might moderate perceptions of preferred counselor characteristics as well.

### Limitations

One limitation of the present study is the dichotomous nature of the judgments that the participants at Time 1 were asked to make. The Likert-type scale that measured degree of helpfulness was used at Time 2 as an attempt to correct this limitation. Additional factors that might be helpful to examine in future research are the influence of education and reading level. It is likely those with more education would be more open to receiving mental health services and have more positive attitudes about mental health care. Furthermore, an increased reading level would contribute to better understanding of some of the characteristics listed in the Adjective Checklist. The effects of income level, gender, and ethnicity should also be examined in that more resources may contribute to increased access to mental health services, and gender and ethnicity likely contribute to attitudes about mental health care and resulting utilization rates of mental health services.

Another limitation of this study is that the characteristics used for the exploratory factor analyses were derived from the ratings made by the small, separate sample of younger adults for the pilot study. Similar data was gathered at Time 2 from the small, separate samples of older and younger adults, and some differences in endorsement of characteristics as contributing positively to each of the three domains were noted. It might be helpful in future research to conduct a confirmatory factor analysis to determine the degree to which older adults' and younger adults' perceptions of helpful counselor characteristics fit into the three-domain social influence model.

Despite these limitations, these data indicate that older and younger adults differ in their perceptions of helpful counselor characteristics. In addition, there appears to have been a cohort effect as well, in that the participants at Time 1 differed in their perceptions from the participants at Time 2.

### Implications

The older adults' pattern of being more discriminating in their perceptions of what counselor characteristics would be helpful suggests mental health professionals should pay close attention to these preferences. Some particular characteristics were endorsed by the older adults that are interesting. For example, the older adults endorsed the characteristics related to gender, masculine and feminine, as being helpful at both Time 1 and Time 2. These endorsements suggest older adults may have more specific preferences about the gender of the counselor. Some older adults may prefer male counselors and some may prefer female counselors. Twenty-four percent of the older Time 1 adults and 38% of the older Time 2 adults indicated counselor gender was important, as compared with 17% of the younger Time 1 adults and 8% of the younger Time 2 adults. Perhaps it would be helpful within a mental health care setting to assess older adults' preferences for counselor gender and then to attempt to match counselor and client appropriately. Future research should examine whether the gender of the participant is related to the preferred gender of the counselor.

Another interesting finding is older adults' endorsement of counselor age as being an important variable. Sixteen percent of the older adults at both Time 1 and Time 2 indicated older counselors are helpful; these results are compared to 1% of the younger Time 1 adults and 10% of the younger Time 2 adults endorsing older counselor age as being important. It could be that older adults prefer older counselors because the older adult participants may more clearly self-

identify themselves as being older and may engage in social comparison processes more frequently, thus allowing them to more positively identify with other older persons. There was a significant difference between the younger and older adults' endorsement of older counselor age as being important at Time 1, but not at Time 2, suggesting there may be cohort shifts in the irrelevance of age as a determinant of who might be a helpful counselor. This finding supports previous research (Hayslip, Schneider, and Bryant, 1989; Thompson and Scott, 1991) .

At Time 2, 8% of the older adults endorsed the characteristic old-fashioned as being helpful, as compared to 3% of the younger adults. This difference in endorsement was significant. Although old-fashioned may not directly relate to counselor age, it is likely there is a relationship between older age of a counselor and old-fashioned values of a counselor. It seems that a small, yet meaningful, percentage of older adults place emphasis on working with counselors who share old-fashioned values, perhaps values similar to their own.

Another characteristic specifically endorsed by a significantly greater number of older adults than younger adults is the characteristic unemotional. Twenty-two percent of the older Time 1 adults and 18% of the older Time 2 adults endorsed unemotional, as compared to 6% of the younger Time 1 adults and 11% of the younger Time 2 adults. This is an interesting finding given the characteristic unemotional connotes a very businesslike, expert counselor, with little social connection to the client. Or, the characteristic could be endorsed in comparison to not wanting to work with a counselor who is overly emotional. Although it is impossible to determine exactly how unemotional was defined by the participants, it seems a more expert, businesslike manner is preferred by a greater number of older adults than younger adults. It is noteworthy there was less of a difference between older and younger adults' endorsement of this

characteristic at Time 2 than at Time 1, which may correspond to the findings that the older Time 2 adults placed more emphasis on counselor interpersonal characteristics than they did at Time 1.

It is unclear whether this differential endorsement of the characteristic unemotional is only related to participants' age. There was also a significant difference in the endorsement of unemotional between those participants who had sought help and those who had not sought help at both Time 1 and Time 2. Nineteen percent of the Time 1 adults and 16% of the Time 2 adults who had not sought help endorsed emotional as being helpful; these findings are compared with the endorsement of unemotional by 4% of the Time 1 adults and 9% of the Time 2 adults who had sought help. Similar to the differential endorsement by age groups, there was less of a difference in endorsement of this characteristic by the two help-seeking / not help-seeking groups at Time 2 than at Time 1. Since participant age is related to previous help-seeking behavior (younger adults have more experience), it is possible previous experience with a counselor contributes to whether an unemotional counselor would be considered helpful. Consequently, the less experience one has, the more one perceives that an unemotional counselor would be helpful. This perception may be based on previous experience with physicians, who are probably perceived as being somewhat unemotional with their patients. Future research may want to examine whether previous help-seeking behavior or counselor age contributes more to the endorsement of unemotional as a helpful counselor characteristic.

Implications for counselor training include teaching awareness of age and cohort differences in perceptions. Assessing the preferences of both older and younger adults regarding whether they prefer older or younger counselors or male or female counselors may be beneficial in that potential clients may feel more comfortable working with a counselor whom they perceive as being more likely to help them. If a counselor/client match cannot be accommodated

based on the client's preferences, then it becomes very important for the counselor to address the concerns of the client, possible disappointments of the client, similarities between the counselor and client, and to work on establishing a strong therapeutic relationship. Furthermore, assessing a client's previous help-seeking experience may be helpful in determining what counselor behaviors the client initially perceives as being most helpful. The less experience a client has with the mental health system, the more likely the client will perceive counselor credibility as being more helpful than counselor attractiveness. Likewise, the more experience a client has with the mental health system, the more likely the client will perceive counselor attractiveness as being more helpful than counselor expertness or trustworthiness. Therefore, emphasizing one's training, credentials, experience, and commitment to confidentiality in a formal manner is of primary importance when working with clients who have less experience with mental health professionals. On the other hand, emphasizing counselor/client similarities and working collaboratively with a more relaxed manner may be more important when working with clients who have more experience with mental health professionals.

Other research supports the idea that there may indeed be historical shifts in attitudes about mental health professionals and in demands for mental health services (Currin, et al., 1998; Koenig, et al. 1994). Based on the present study, it is unclear what counselor preferences future cohorts of younger and older consumers of mental health services will have. It is hypothesized that as experience with mental health care increases, more emphasis will be placed on counselor attractiveness characteristics than on counselor credibility. Whether future clients are satisfied with the mental health care received is important, however. If they are not satisfied, then counselor credibility may become more important. Therefore, in addition to assessing for

previous experience with mental health professionals, future research should assess the participants' perceptions of how helpful this previous experience was to them.



## APPENDIX

Table A1 presents the eigenvalues and percentage of common variance associated with each principal component for the younger Time 1 sample.

Table A1

Principal Components for the Time 1 (1991) Younger Group

Factor	Eigenvalue	Percentage of Variance	Cumulative Percentage
1	7.37	23.0	23.0
2	2.21	6.9	29.9
3	1.83	5.7	35.7
4	1.53	4.8	40.4
5	1.43	4.5	44.9
6	1.28	4.0	48.9
7	1.22	3.8	52.7
8	1.18	3.7	56.4
9	1.15	3.6	60.0
10	1.05	3.3	63.3

Table A2 presents the rotated factor matrix for the ten factors resulting from the principal components analysis for the Time 1 younger group.

Table A2

Rotated Factor Matrix from Principal Components Analysis for Time 1 (1991) Younger Group

Variable	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5
Capable	.059	.211	.119	<u>.676</u>	.086
Clear-thinking	.163	-.086	<u>.403</u>	.338	.374
Confident	<u>.451</u>	.076	.035	<u>.434</u>	.136
Considerate	.310	.061	.304	<u>.416</u>	.279
Cooperative	<u>.600</u>	.344	.110	-.010	-.010
Dependable	.180	.058	<u>.527</u>	.055	-.016
Dignified	.045	.057	.104	.239	-.009
Good-looking	.074	.079	.014	.008	.042
Helpful	.085	.042	.069	.149	.171
Honest	.176	.285	.165	.225	.105
Humorous	.154	.122	.112	-.020	<u>.576</u>
Insightful	.009	.147	.188	<u>.423</u>	.190
Intelligent	.215	.043	.115	<u>.428</u>	-.133
Logical	.018	.039	<u>.715</u>	.051	.108
Mature	.252	-.010	.381	.167	.190
Patient	-.124	.048	.045	<u>.662</u>	.002
Self-confident	.159	<u>.424</u>	.144	.076	.198
Sincere	.025	.360	.241	.111	.110

(table continues)

Table A2 Continued

Rotated Factor Matrix from Principal Components Analysis for Time 1 (1991) Younger Group

Variable	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5
Stable	.049	-.114	.231	.324	<u>.512</u>
Sympathetic	<u>.797</u>	-.069	-.041	.142	.092
Thorough	-.085	.187	.117	.215	<u>.561</u>
Thoughtful	.129	<u>.702</u>	-.009	.178	-.049
Trustworthy	<u>.490</u>	.031	<u>.504</u>	.232	.083
Enthusiastic	.251	<u>.508</u>	.130	-.091	<u>.483</u>
Forgiving	<u>.492</u>	.352	-.123	-.030	<u>.424</u>
Frank	-.017	.240	<u>.422</u>	.042	-.137
Gentle	<u>.568</u>	.222	.211	-.252	.091
Praising	.264	<u>.472</u>	.108	-.058	<u>.542</u>
Rational	.120	-.174	.059	.090	.153
Realistic	-.044	.298	<u>.629</u>	.162	.261
Relaxed	.034	<u>.730</u>	.152	.121	.169
Wise	.044	.065	.091	.064	.161

Table A2 Continued

Rotated Factor Matrix from Principal Components Analysis for Time 1 (1991) Younger Group

Variable	Factor 6	Factor 7	Factor 8	Factor 9	Factor 10
Capable	.153	-.041	.028	-.121	.069
Clear-thinking	<u>.475</u>	-.006	.001	-.158	-.094
Confident	-.273	.068	.242	-.238	.316
Considerate	.163	.076	-.026	-.143	.069
Cooperative	.157	.140	.017	.233	-.149
Dependable	.159	<u>.500</u>	-.031	.159	.144
Dignified	.122	.234	.102	.043	<u>.711</u>
Good-looking	-.034	-.100	-.005	<u>.831</u>	.044
Helpful	<u>.626</u>	.322	.177	.188	.076
Honest	<u>.718</u>	.042	-.012	-.133	.056
Humorous	.198	.177	.026	.281	-.164
Insightful	-.376	.195	.322	.113	-.337
Intelligent	.260	.285	.057	-.180	-.394
Logical	.019	.139	.142	.078	-.048
Mature	.241	.214	-.378	-.084	.006
Patient	.151	.119	.060	.249	.151
Self-confident	.242	-.168	<u>.498</u>	-.304	-.065
Sincere	.283	<u>.475</u>	.069	-.257	.179

(table continues)

Table A2 Continued

Rotated Factor Matrix from Principal Components Analysis for Time 1 (1991) Younger Group

Variable	Factor 6	Factor 7	Factor 8	Factor 9	Factor 10
Stable	.030	.069	.058	-.019	.269
Sympathetic	.106	-.131	.137	.120	.020
Thorough	.144	.167	.341	-.134	-.129
Thoughtful	.115	.218	-.000	.126	.047
Trustworthy	.031	.187	-.179	-.217	.080
Enthusiastic	.227	-.031	.202	-.130	.217
Forgiving	-.008	.122	-.087	.039	-.052
Frank	.106	.005	<u>.493</u>	.039	.036
Gentle	.126	.193	.034	-.139	.086
Praising	-.055	-.022	-.090	.008	.158
Rational	.009	.110	<u>.757</u>	.017	.105
Realistic	.119	-.064	.186	-.102	.114
Relaxed	.002	.006	-.014	.037	-.076
Wise	.044	<u>.831</u>	.034	-.091	.063

Note. The criteria used to define a significant loading was .40.

Table A3 presents the eigenvalues and percentage of common variance associated with each principal component for the older Time 1 sample.

Table A3

Principal Components for the Time 1 (1991) Older Group

Factor	Eigenvalue	Percentage of Variance	Cumulative Percentage
1	10.64	33.2	33.2
2	1.86	5.8	39.1
3	1.63	5.1	44.1
4	1.29	4.0	48.2
5	1.22	3.8	52.0
6	1.18	3.7	55.7
7	1.12	3.5	59.2
8	1.01	3.2	62.4

Table A4 presents the rotated factor matrix for the eight factors resulting from the principal components analysis for the Time 1 older group.

Table A4

Rotated Factor Matrix from Principal Components Analysis for Time 1 (1991) Older Group

Variable	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5
Capable	.233	.071	<u>.617</u>	.235	.083
Clear-thinking	.201	<u>.566</u>	<u>.486</u>	.151	-.053
Confident	.095	<u>.480</u>	.195	.207	.369
Considerate	.228	.134	<u>.718</u>	.064	.251

(table continues)

Table A4 Continued

Rotated Factor Matrix from Principal Components Analysis for Time 1 (1991) Older Group

Variable	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5
Cooperative	.162	.326	.209	.161	<u>.700</u>
Dependable	.094	.095	<u>.558</u>	.398	<u>.415</u>
Dignified	.060	<u>.642</u>	.176	.058	.086
Good-looking	.137	.098	-.152	.083	.145
Helpful	.093	<u>.456</u>	<u>.587</u>	.156	.081
Honest	.210	.059	.265	<u>.673</u>	.168
Humorous	<u>.535</u>	.197	.383	-.036	.275
Insightful	.085	.164	.191	.009	.008
Intelligent	.176	.242	<u>.525</u>	<u>.539</u>	.040
Logical	.089	<u>.494</u>	.171	.003	.169
Mature	.111	.394	.256	<u>.468</u>	.160
Patient	.169	.043	.059	<u>.649</u>	.028
Self-confident	.088	.186	.091	.051	.133
Sincere	.179	.271	.181	.387	.299
Stable	<u>.640</u>	.206	.133	.055	.073
Sympathetic	.251	-.006	.176	.034	<u>.675</u>
Thorough	.197	.363	.033	.305	<u>.431</u>
Thoughtful	<u>.608</u>	.050	.343	.106	.260

(table continues)



Table A4 Continued

Rotated Factor Matrix from Principal Components Analysis for Time 1 (1991) Older Group

Variable	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5
Trustworthy	<u>.658</u>	.118	.254	.304	.016
Enthusiastic	.204	<u>.513</u>	.034	.034	.397
Forgiving	<u>.593</u>	.081	.063	.127	.346
Frank	.214	<u>.409</u>	.017	<u>.509</u>	-.005
Gentle	<u>.696</u>	.169	.140	.330	.135
Praising	.375	.146	.026	.067	<u>.450</u>
Rational	.219	.190	.195	-.001	-.014
Realistic	.047	.058	.124	.359	.236
Relaxed	<u>.467</u>	<u>.496</u>	.073	.100	.251
Wise	.398	<u>.558</u>	-.014	.303	.034

Table A4 Continued

Rotated Factor Matrix from Principal Components Analysis for Time 1 (1991) Older Group

Variable	Factor 6	Factor 7	Factor 8
Capable	.264	-.152	.013
Clear-thinking	.045	.090	.099
Confident	-.108	.100	.098
Considerate	.211	-.085	.142

(table continues)

Table A4 Continued

Rotated Factor Matrix from Principal Components Analysis for Time 1 (1991) Older Group

Variable	Factor 6	Factor 7	Factor 8
Cooperative	.033	.020	.075
Dependable	.205	.034	.012
Dignified	.150	.073	.054
Good-looking	-.047	<u>.845</u>	-.059
Helpful	.025	-.030	.038
Honest	-.043	-.007	-.035
Humorous	.065	.120	-.126
Insightful	<u>.594</u>	<u>.577</u>	.091
Intelligent	.058	.070	-.035
Logical	.397	.143	.204
Mature	.147	.113	.084
Patient	.108	.037	<u>.425</u>
Self-confident	.161	-.072	<u>.766</u>
Sincere	.347	-.198	-.239
Stable	.304	.085	.131
Sympathetic	.131	.131	.110
Thorough	<u>.412</u>	-.180	-.107

(table continues)

Table A4 Continued

Rotated Factor Matrix from Principal Components Analysis for Time 1 (1991) Older Group

Variable	Factor 6	Factor 7	Factor 8
Thoughtful	.032	.198	.047
Trustworthy	.151	-.046	.001
Enthusiastic	.333	.013	.120
Forgiving	.012	.176	.261
Frank	.267	.143	-.078
Gentle	.050	-.060	.051
Praising	.051	.143	<u>.412</u>
Rational	<u>.708</u>	-.082	.055
Realistic	<u>.663</u>	.075	.224
Relaxed	.264	-.054	-.067
Wise	.071	-.036	.154

Note. The criteria used to define a significant loading was .40.

Table A5 presents the eigenvalues and percentage of common variance associated with each principal component for the younger Time 2 sample.

Table A5

Principal Components for the Time 2 (2001) Younger Group

Factor	Eigenvalue	Percentage of Variance	Cumulative Percentage
1	6.70	20.9	20.9
2	1.99	6.2	27.1
3	1.76	5.5	32.7
4	1.45	4.5	37.2
5	1.41	4.4	41.6
6	1.37	4.3	45.9
7	1.34	4.2	50.0
8	1.21	3.8	53.8
9	1.12	3.5	57.3
10	1.02	3.2	60.5

Table A6 presents the rotated factor matrix for the ten factors resulting from the principal components analysis for the Time 2 younger group.

Table A6

Rotated Factor Matrix from Principal Components Analysis for Time 2 (2001) Younger Group

Variable	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5
Capable	<u>.602</u>	.046	.145	.186	.023
Clear-thinking	.272	.139	.180	.044	-.009

(table continues)

Table A6 Continued

Rotated Factor Matrix from Principal Components Analysis for Time 2 (2001) Younger Group

Variable	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5
Confident	.084	.185	.045	<u>.745</u>	.070
Considerate	.379	<u>.440</u>	.145	.337	.084
Cooperative	.124	<u>.676</u>	.053	-.031	-.067
Dependable	.212	.161	<u>.693</u>	.169	-.150
Dignified	.363	.117	.018	.255	.178
Good-looking	.062	.115	.023	-.096	-.156
Helpful	-.003	.128	-.109	.129	.025
Honest	.028	.076	.180	-.051	-.061
Humorous	.021	.187	.165	.245	.298
Insightful	<u>.551</u>	.159	.265	.061	-.123
Intelligent	<u>.417</u>	.078	-.130	.116	.305
Logical	.293	.365	.244	.114	-.139
Mature	.133	-.069	<u>.654</u>	.168	.044
Patient	.175	.097	.356	.086	.267
Self-confident	.132	-.024	.146	<u>.757</u>	-.011
Sincere	<u>.514</u>	.136	.069	<u>.418</u>	.236
Stable	-.025	.175	.314	.328	.244
Sympathetic	.185	<u>.708</u>	-.117	.128	.082

(table continues)

Table A6 Continued

Rotated Factor Matrix from Principal Components Analysis for Time 2 (2001) Younger Group

Variable	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5
Thorough	<u>.698</u>	.110	.097	.033	.151
Thoughtful	.224	<u>.598</u>	.147	.354	-.008
Trustworthy	.051	.127	<u>.744</u>	-.032	.246
Enthusiastic	.098	.126	-.017	.168	.077
Forgiving	-.105	<u>.593</u>	.158	.057	.287
Frank	.096	-.050	-.076	.001	.025
Gentle	.080	<u>.514</u>	.156	-.078	<u>.452</u>
Praising	.297	.286	.140	-.058	.279
Rational	<u>.646</u>	.152	-.001	-.064	.114
Realistic	.195	.128	-.031	-.091	-.080
Relaxed	.198	-.005	-.026	.115	<u>.741</u>
Wise	.128	.347	.287	.060	<u>.524</u>

Table A6 Continued

Rotated Factor Matrix from Principal Components Analysis for Time 2 (2001) Younger Group

Variable	Factor 6	Factor 7	Factor 8	Factor 9	Factor 10
Capable	.060	.147	.108	-.121	.137
Clear-thinking	<u>.719</u>	-.019	-.004	.102	-.048

(table continues)

Table A6 Continued

Rotated Factor Matrix from Principal Components Analysis for Time 2 (2001) Younger Group

Variable	Factor 6	Factor 7	Factor 8	Factor 9	Factor 10
Confident	.074	.003	-.010	.009	.024
Considerate	-.024	.124	.043	.217	-.013
Cooperative	.031	-.019	.350	-.092	.059
Dependable	.012	-.106	-.182	.144	-.037
Dignified	.080	.175	.218	.091	-.102
Good-looking	<u>-.751</u>	.023	.022	-.015	.004
Helpful	-.181	-.054	-.030	.215	<u>.710</u>
Honest	.112	-.001	.223	<u>.753</u>	.139
Humorous	-.054	<u>.412</u>	.344	.119	-.291
Insightful	.213	.060	.042	.126	.264
Intelligent	.366	-.082	-.175	.365	-.089
Logical	.377	.367	.093	-.163	-.029
Mature	.019	.163	.220	.143	.009
Patient	.208	.154	.021	-.121	<u>.640</u>
Self-confident	.108	.004	.175	-.070	.181
Sincere	-.054	.044	.082	.302	-.111
Stable	-.068	.269	-.259	.376	.067
Sympathetic	.015	.058	-.084	.107	.178

(table continues)

Table A6 Continued

Rotated Factor Matrix from Principal Components Analysis for Time 2 (2001) Younger Group

Variable	Factor 6	Factor 7	Factor 8	Factor 9	Factor 10
Thorough	.059	-.120	.059	.033	-.026
Thoughtful	.067	-.123	-.004	-.055	.056
Trustworthy	.106	-.117	.004	-.037	.040
Enthusiastic	-.040	-.122	<u>.674</u>	.080	-.003
Forgiving	-.082	.146	.181	.165	-.177
Frank	.040	<u>.804</u>	-.133	.015	.036
Gentle	.057	-.029	.073	.159	.138
Praising	-.228	-.090	.386	.101	-.148
Rational	.026	<u>.460</u>	.039	-.065	.040
Realistic	.350	.367	<u>.462</u>	.319	.096
Relaxed	.182	.023	.114	-.123	.051
Wise	-.039	.127	-.043	.108	.166

Note. The criteria used to define a significant loading was .40.

Table A7 presents the eigenvalues and percentage of common variance associated with each principal component for the older Time 2 sample.



Table A7

Principal Components for the Time 2 (2001) Older Group

Factor	Eigenvalue	Percentage of Variance	Cumulative Percentage
1	8.45	26.4	26.4
2	2.08	6.5	32.9
3	1.63	5.1	38.0
4	1.42	4.4	42.4
5	1.26	3.9	46.4
6	1.22	3.8	50.2
7	1.15	3.6	53.8
8	1.13	3.5	57.3
9	1.05	3.3	60.6
10	1.03	3.2	63.8

Table A8 presents the rotated factor matrix for the ten factors resulting from the principal components analysis for the Time 2 older group.

Table A8

Rotated Factor Matrix from Principal Components Analysis for Time 2 (2001) Older Group

Variable	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5
Capable	.009	.143	.206	<u>.631</u>	.227
Clear-thinking	.136	.100	.027	<u>.780</u>	.030

(table continues)

Table A8 Continued

Rotated Factor Matrix from Principal Components Analysis for Time 2 (2001) Older Group

Variable	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5
Confident	-.005	.250	.025	.295	.316
Considerate	.047	.093	<u>.800</u>	.142	-.072
Cooperative	.257	.015	.139	.118	.152
Dependable	.057	.155	.142	<u>.550</u>	-.003
Dignified	.025	<u>.435</u>	.073	.043	.129
Good-looking	.138	-.034	-.012	-.025	.112
Helpful	.098	.127	.037	.159	.024
Honest	-.010	-.081	.093	-.120	.073
Humorous	.384	.083	<u>.406</u>	.088	-.020
Insightful	-.134	<u>.680</u>	.227	.071	.134
Intelligent	.042	.164	.320	.338	.314
Logical	.072	<u>.505</u>	-.011	.236	<u>.479</u>
Mature	.108	.094	.254	.147	.143
Patient	.108	.182	<u>.519</u>	.195	.247
Self-confident	.243	<u>.413</u>	.009	.359	-.201
Sincere	.054	.162	<u>.606</u>	.073	.271
Stable	.238	.225	.178	.335	<u>.481</u>
Sympathetic	<u>.467</u>	.052	.309	.263	.116

(table continues)

Table A8 Continued

Rotated Factor Matrix from Principal Components Analysis for Time 2 (2001) Older Group

Variable	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5
Thorough	.180	<u>.468</u>	.228	.100	<u>.448</u>
Thoughtful	.221	.108	<u>.514</u>	-.105	<u>.503</u>
Trustworthy	.100	.038	.043	.037	<u>.731</u>
Enthusiastic	.349	<u>.445</u>	.271	.031	-.025
Forgiving	<u>.799</u>	.052	-.043	.005	.053
Frank	.119	.295	.126	.232	.094
Gentle	<u>.754</u>	.038	.024	.196	.177
Praising	<u>.714</u>	.140	.129	-.029	.032
Rational	.229	<u>.618</u>	.052	.197	.055
Realistic	.165	<u>.502</u>	.011	.171	.141
Relaxed	.315	<u>.532</u>	.031	-.037	.001
Wise	<u>.433</u>	.223	.144	.060	.138

Table A8 Continued

Rotated Factor Matrix from Principal Components Analysis for Time 2 (2001) Older Group

Variable	Factor 6	Factor 7	Factor 8	Factor 9	Factor 10
Capable	.129	.226	-.061	.149	.066
Clear-thinking	.058	.001	.178	.077	-.007

(table continues)

Table A8 Continued

Rotated Factor Matrix from Principal Components Analysis for Time 2 (2001) Older Group

Variable	Factor 6	Factor 7	Factor 8	Factor 9	Factor 10
Confident	<u>.519</u>	-.027	.050	.189	.289
Considerate	.124	.148	-.160	.074	-.072
Cooperative	<u>.729</u>	.007	.117	.009	.027
Dependable	<u>.457</u>	.094	.058	-.161	-.115
Dignified	.346	.259	.331	.124	.144
Good-looking	.061	.061	.013	.034	<u>.792</u>
Helpful	.106	.073	<u>.829</u>	.076	.028
Honest	.070	.293	<u>.401</u>	<u>.686</u>	-.130
Humorous	.333	.022	-.033	.284	-.018
Insightful	.011	.060	-.036	.106	.096
Intelligent	-.127	<u>.456</u>	-.271	.130	.051
Logical	-.058	.191	.172	.046	-.117
Mature	.069	<u>.757</u>	.098	.029	.114
Patient	.245	.110	.254	.078	-.253
Self-confident	.025	.123	.067	.007	<u>.404</u>
Sincere	-.071	.237	.226	.053	.141
Stable	.038	.206	.101	-.197	.040
Sympathetic	.233	.031	.297	-.048	.017

(table continues)

Table A8 Continued

Rotated Factor Matrix from Principal Components Analysis for Time 2 (2001) Older Group

Variable	Factor 6	Factor 7	Factor 8	Factor 9	Factor 10
Thorough	.058	-.037	.253	-.007	.014
Thoughtful	.139	-.096	.214	.084	.180
Trustworthy	.244	.171	-.110	.185	.077
Enthusiastic	.350	.229	.062	-.069	.184
Forgiving	.167	.268	.046	-.023	.160
Frank	.037	-.125	-.103	<u>.709</u>	.164
Gentle	.009	.017	-.098	.107	-.064
Praising	.141	-.122	.130	-.001	.149
Rational	.017	-.156	.197	.047	-.020
Realistic	.179	.382	-.112	.190	-.219
Relaxed	.355	.296	-.044	.013	-.176
Wise	-.163	.172	.173	.348	.042

Note. The criteria used to define a significant loading was .40.

## REFERENCES

- Barak, A., & Dell, D. M. (1977). Differential perceptions of counselor behavior: Replication and extension. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 24, 288-292.
- Barak, A., & LaCrosse, M. B. (1975). Multidimensional perception of counselor behavior. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 22, 471-476.
- Cash, T. F., Kehr, J., & Salzbach, R. F. (1978). Help-seeking attitudes and perceptions of counselor behavior. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 25, 264-269.
- Corrigan, J. D. (1978). Salient attributes of two types of helpers: Friends and mental health professionals. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 25, 588-590.
- Corrigan, J. D., Dell, D. M., Lewis, K. N., & Schmidt, L. D. (1980). Counseling as a social influence process: A review. Journal of Counseling Psychology Monograph, 27, 395-441.
- Curran, J. B., Hayslip, B., Jr., Schneider, L. J., & Kookan, R. A. (1998). Cohort differences in attitudes toward mental health services among older persons. Psychotherapy, 35, 506-518.
- Elliott, R. (1985). Helpful and nonhelpful events in brief counseling interviews: An empirical taxonomy. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 32, 307-322.
- Elliott, R., & James, E. (1989). Varieties of client experience in psychotherapy: An analysis of the literature. Clinical Psychology Review, 9, 443-467.
- Festinger, L. (1957). A theory of cognitive dissonance. Evanston, IL: Row, Peterson.
- Gough, H. G. (1960). The Adjective Check List as a personality assessment technique. Psychological Reports, 6, 107-122.
- Gough, H. G., & Heilbrun, A. B., Jr. (1983). The Adjective Check List Manual (Rev. Ed.). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Gurin, G., Veroff, J., & Feld, S. (1960). Americans view their mental health. New York: Basic Books.

Hayslip, B., Jr., Schneider, L. J., & Bryant, K. (1989). Older women's perceptions of female counselors: The influence of therapist age and problem intimacy. The Gerontologist, 29, 239-244.

Hayslip, B., Jr., & Utermark, T. (2001, March). Cohort differences in perceptions of helpful counselor characteristics. Poster session accepted for presentation in March at the meeting of the annual Houston Counseling Psychology Conference, Houston, TX.

Koenig, H. G., George, L. K., & Schneider, R. (1994). Mental health care for older adults in the year 2020: A dangerous and avoided topic. Gerontologist, 34, 674-679.

LaCrosse, M. B., & Barak, A. (1976). Differential perception of counselor behavior. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 23, 170-172.

Lasoski, M. C. (1986). Reasons for low utilization of mental health services by the elderly. Clinical Gerontologist, 5, 1-18.

Lasoski, M. C., & Thelen, M. H. (1987). Attitudes of older and middle-aged persons toward mental health intervention. Gerontologist, 27, 288-292.

Lazarus, L. W., Sadavoy, J., & Langsley, P. R. (1991). Individual psychotherapy. In J. Sadavoy & L. W. Lazarus (Eds.), Comprehensive review of geriatric psychiatry, (pp. 487-512). Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Press, Inc.

Lundervold, D. A., & Young, L. G. (1992). Older adults' attitudes and knowledge regarding use of mental health services. Journal of Clinical and Experimental Gerontology, 14, 45-55.

- Paulson, B. L., Truscott, D., & Stuart, J. (1999). Clients' perceptions of helpful experiences in counseling. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 46, 317-324.
- Schmidt, L. D., & Strong, S. R. (1971). Attractiveness and influence in counseling. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 18, 348-351.
- Schneider, L. J., & Lankford, C. P. (1978). College females' disclosure to professional helpers and perceptions of helpers' characteristics. College Student Journal, 12, 61-66.
- Spitzer, A., Bar-Tal, Y., & Ziv, L. (1996). The moderating effect of age on self-care. Western Journal of Nursing Research, 18, 136-148.
- Strong, S. R. (1968). Counseling: An interpersonal influence process. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 15, 215-224.
- Strong, S. R., & Dixon, D. N. (1971). Expertness, attractiveness, and influence in counseling. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 18, 562-570.
- Thompson, J. D., & Scott N. A. (1991). Counseling service features: Elders' preferences and utilization. Clinical Gerontologist, 11, 39-46.
- U. S. Bureau of the Census. (1998). Statistical Abstract of the United States. Washington, DC: U. S. Government Printing Office.
- Utermark, T., & Hayslip, B., Jr. (2000). Cohort differences in perceptions of helpful counselor characteristics. Unpublished manuscript.
- Veroff, J., Douvan, E., & Kulka, R. A. (1981). The inner American: A self-portrait from 1957 to 1976. New York: Basic Books.
- Veroff, J., Kulka, R. A., & Douvan, E. (1981). Mental health in America: Patterns of help-seeking from 1957-1976. New York: Basic Books, Inc.



Waxman, H. M., Carner, E. A., & Klein, M. (1984). Underutilization of mental health professionals by community elderly. Gerontologist, 24, 23-30.

Yang, J. A., & Jackson, C. L. (1998). Overcoming obstacles in providing mental health treatment to older adults: Getting in the door. Psychotherapy, 35, 498-505.

Zank, S. (1998). Psychotherapy and aging: Results of two empirical studies between psychotherapists and elderly people. Psychotherapy, 35, 531-536.